

Great Barrier Island marine reserve proposal - Summary of submissions to proposal

Submission number	Date	Address 2	Address 3	Organisation / Iwi	Involvement: Resident	Involvement: Land Owner	Involvement: Regular Visitor	Involvement: Occasional Visitor	Involvement: Overseas Visitor	Involvement: Other	Frequency of use: N=Never OC=Occasionally O=Often	Use: Customary fishing	Use: Commercial fishing	Use: Recreational Fishing	Use: Boating	Use: Diving	Use: Other recreation	Use: Education	Use: Science	Use: Other	Do you support the principle of a marine reserve somewhere on the NE coast of GBI?	Type of submission: S=Support QS=Qualified support O=Objection QO=Qualified objection
1	28.03.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y						OC			1	1	1	1				Y	QS
2	1.04.03	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y						O			1	1		1				N	QO
3	1.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y						O			1		1	1	1			N	QO
4	1.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O	1		1		1	1				N	QO
5	1.04.03		Great Barrier Is		Y						O			1	1	1	1				N	QO
6	1.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O	1		1	1	1	1	1			N	OO
7	1.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC	1		1		1	1				N	OO
8	1.04.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y						OC						1				Y	S
9	1.04.03		Auckland 1	Spirit Of Adventure Trust (Senior Master)			Y				O				1			1		1	Y	S
10	2.04.03	Birkenhead	Auckland	Samurai Fishing Charters							Not given										Not given	OO
11	2.04.03	Mt Albert	Auckland					Y			OC					1	1				Y	S
12	2.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O	1					1				Y	QS
13	2.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC			1	1	1	1				Y	QS
14	2.04.03	Okaheka	Rotorua					Y			N				1	1	1		1	1	Y	S
15	2.04.03	Medlands Beach	Great Barrier Is								O			1	1	1	1	1			Y	OO
16	2.04.03	Okupu	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O	1		1	1	1	1	1			N	OO
17	2.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC					1	1				Y	S
18	2.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is					Y			OC						1				N	OO
19	2.04.03	RD1	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O	1		1	1	1	1				N	OO

Great Barrier Island marine reserve proposal - Summary of submissions to proposal

Reason for support or opposition	What part of the Whangapoua Estuary should be excluded from the proposal?	Are there any areas on NE coast that should NOT be protected as a marine reserve?	Are there any areas on NE coast of GBI or elsewhere that should be protected as a marine reserve?	Questionnaire
Concerned whether questionnaire is going to be taken into account prior to decision on reserve proposal being made. Wants residents to feel involved in process.	Part	Parts of area 1, 2 & 5 (Whangapoua beach & Rakitu Island).		Yes
Feels that commercial fishing does the damage to environment. Fishing for food could improve with a reserve. Estuary & beach are an asset to locals. Concerned about spread of mangroves. Weather is controlling factor in this area.	All	Areas 1, 2 & part of 4 out to Rakitu Island.	Areas 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
Will not give support as believes this means they will be counted as supporting an adjusted boundary in future.	All	Areas that public can access to hook fish should be available for use e.g. southern area.		Yes
We do support a reserve but only in area from the Needles to Miner's Head.	All	All	Area between the Needles & Miner's Head.	Yes
Reserve should be in the Gulf. No benefit. Estuary is important for shellfish gathering.	Part	Area south of line from Waikaro Point (includes areas 1, 2, 4 & 5).	From Mabey's (Waikaro) Point 3 miles out around coast to Miner's Head.	Yes
The weather & island's location keep most people out already. I am against a reserve as it only benefits a few commercial operators & divers.	All	All coastal areas including 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.		Yes
No shellfish, fish & crayfish can be taken if reserve established. I enjoy a feed of shellfish from estuary.	Part			Yes
I believe in marine reserves & wish to see 10% protection target achieved.	Part for iwi			Yes
Reserve will preserve unique character of GBI coast. Would like to continue to anchor in area & be able to land people at some parts of coast.	None			Yes
Waste of time & will cause downfall of fishing charter operators. Also concerned that the Ministry of Fisheries allows by-catch that will cause the extinction of species such as kingfish.				Letter
Fish life will rejuvenate meaning better snorkeling & swimming. Make reserve as big as possible.				Yes
Value-add tourism & enriched marine stocks. Locals should be allowed to gather shellfish during some times of year.	Seasonal	None		Yes
Support the principle of nursery areas. Would be nice to be able to gather shellfish.	Part			Yes
Greater opportunity for increased recreational experience & opportunity for gaining scientific information. Will hopefully benefit the quality of life for residents & visitors to area,	None	None		Yes
No benefit & will stop us gathering shellfish. Reserve is being proposed in wrong place as there will be nowhere on east side of GBI to fish. How will it be policed?	Part	All	Little Barrier Island	Yes
No need for it & it includes my favourite fishing spots. My children enjoy collecting shellfish & diving. There are plenty of fish here.	All	All		Yes
Reserve would enhance the island's beauty & will encourage people to learn more about marine life. Will hopefully increase peoples' respect for the sea.				Yes
I like to think I can fish sensibly in area whenever I want.				Yes
Myself & others use this area to feed our families. Reserve will have negative impact on surrounding areas because of increase in taking of fish by amateurs & will attract more commercial fishing boats.	All	All		Yes

20	3.04.03	Matakana	Matakana			Y					O		1	1		1	1				N	OO	
21	3.04.03	Schooner Bay	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC						1				1	Y	S
22	4.04.03	RD 1 Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O			1	1	1						Y	QS
23	7.04.03	Albert St	Auckland	Bluefins Spearfishing Club (President)			Y				OC			1	1	1						Y	S
24	7.04.03	Hoskyns Rd	Christchurch				Y				OC			1		1	1					Y	S
25	7.04.03	Kaeo	Northland				Y				OC		1	1	1		1					N	OO
26	7.04.03		Leigh	Ngatiwai Pakiri iwi, Taumata B Whanau Pakiri Beach (Representative)		Y	Y				N											Y	S
27	8.04.03		Matakana				Y				O		1	1		1						N	OO
28	8.04.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O			1	1							Y	QO
29	8.04.03		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC			1	1		1					Y	QS
30	8.04.03	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O	1		1	1	1						N	QO
31	8.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y						O			1	1		1					Y	S
32	8.04.03	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is			Y					O			1	1		1					N	OO
33	8.04.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is	Foromor Fishing Charters	Y	Y					OC			1			1				1	N	OO
34	9.04.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y						O	1		1	1	1	1					Y	QO
35	9.04.03	Takapuna	Auckland				Y				O			1	1	1	1					Y	S
36	9.04.03	Cheam, Surrey	United Kingdom			Y					Not given	1		1	1	1	1					N	OO
37	9.04.03	Crestmead, Brisbane	Australia			Y					O	1		1	1	1	1					N	OO
38	9.04.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC			1		1	1					Y	S
39	10.04.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC						1					Y	QS
40	10.04.03		Hokitika	Department of Conservation (Technical Support Officer)					Y		N											Y	S
41	10.04.03	Whangaparaoa	Auckland			Y					O			1	1		1					Y	S
42	10.04.03	Whangaparapara	Great Barrier Is	Department of Conservation (Ranger)	Y	Y					O			1	1	1	1	1		1		Y	QS
43	10.04.03	Papamoa	Tauranga				Y				OC			1		1	1					Y	S
44	10.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y						O			1			1					N	OO
45	10.04.03	RD1	Warkworth			Y					O		1	1		1						N	OO
46	11.04.03	Not given	Not given								Not given											Not given	Not given

We fish there in winter & area includes safe anchorages. A reserve would disrupt our operation considerably. We also gather shellfish in area.	Part	All	Navy zone	Yes
Tourism spin-offs & reserve will enhance an already special area. Why have the outer limit at 12 miles, why not 200?	None	None		Yes
Area 3 only should be a reserve. Do not limit access to one of the best resources for locals.	Part	Areas 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Area 3.	Yes
Scenic diving & underwater photography. Enhanced biodiversity. Protect fisheries stocks elsewhere.	None	Pinnacles & rocks north of the Needles (north end of area 3).		Yes
Ecology preservation, species restoration, maintenance of ecological diversity & maritime conservation. Happy to move my fishing activity.	None	None		Yes
Unnecessary - Quota Management System is all NZ needs.				Yes
Support only the proposed area for reserve & not anywhere else on GBI. Would also support reserve for Little Barrier Island.	None	None	Little Barrier Island.	Yes
Area is impossible to police.		Areas 3, 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 1, 2, 4 & 5.	Yes
Increase in fish around edge of reserve. But area extends too far out to sea & impinges on game fishing grounds. Second submissions says: I do not support the marine reserve as proposed as it is far too large. Locals have a need to fish for food.	Part	Area 6, 7 & 8.	Area 2, 3, 4 & part of 5. Cuvier Island or Mokohinau Islands.	Yes
Fish and other marine life will benefit but I would like to continue fishing. Support banning commercial fishing from area.		Areas where I fish.		Yes
Don't support it as I won't be able to get food.	All	Areas 2, 3, 4 & 5.		Yes
Support area but think you are taking too much local fishing areas. Trawlers should be banned as a start.				Yes
Fishing & shell fishing is part of life on GBI & a source of income for some.	All	All	Little Barrier Island	Yes
Area not used much - I rarely see more than 1 or 2 pleasure craft in this area as it is an exposed coast. Already enough reserves in region. Will prevent recreational activity. Would support large-scale commercial fishing being banned from area.		All		Yes & letter
No benefit to me as I fish & gather shellfish in area.	Part	Areas 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 & 8.	Areas 3 & 7.	Yes
Replenish fish stocks & preserve reefs, thereby enhancing my enjoyment of a relatively unscathed piece of NZ.				Yes
Not given.				Yes
Not given.				Yes
Enhanced diving & snorkeling, flow-on benefits to other industries on island, benefits to ecology. Will put GBI on map & provide employment.				Yes
Good place for fish to breed but proposed area is too big.	Part	Areas 1, 2 & 4.	Areas 3, 6 & 7.	Yes
As a diver, I would visit this place if it was a reserve. Would expect to see greater abundance of sea life.				Yes
Not given.				Yes
NZ will benefit in years to come. Locals need access to coastal areas to take shellfish & to fish.	Part	Area 3	Navy zone	Yes
Improved diving & better fishing outside the reserve in longer term. Excellent idea to go from estuarine to deeper waters.				Yes
Marine resources will benefit but no benefit for myself. A reserve will put pressure on marine resources in other parts of GBI.	Part			Yes
No benefit, the Quota Management System is adequate & Navy zone already closed. The weather protects area already. This area is the only fishing ground available in south-west wind.	All	All		Yes
I agree with marine reserves but not in this case.				Yes

47	11.04.03		Thames	Coromandel Charters & Tours NZ Ltd (Managing Director)			Y													N	OO				
48	11.04.03	RD1 Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y								1	1						1	Y	QS		
49	14.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y																1	Y	QS		
50	14.04.03	Not given	Not given			Y																N	QO		
51	14.04.03	Mt Eden	Auckland			Y																N	OO		
52	15.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y									1								N	QO		
53	15.04.03	RD1	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y																1	Y	QS	
54	16.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y								1								1	N	OO	
55	16.04.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y								1								1	N	OO	
56	16.04.03	1RD	Bulls																			Y	S		
57	22.04.03	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y								1									Y	S	
58	22.04.03	Te Atatu Peninsula	Waitakere City	Forest & Bird - Waitakere Branch (Chairperson)																			Y	QS	
59	23.04.03	Westmere	Auckland																			1	Y	S	
60	23.04.03		Blenheim											1								1	Y	S	
61	23.04.03	Three Kings	Auckland	Rovers Fishing Club (Secretary)										1	1								N	OO	
62	24.04.03	St Heliers	Auckland				Y							1	1	1	1						N	OO	
63	29.04.03		Great Barrier Is			Y																1	Y	S	
64	30.04.03	Medlands Beach	Great Barrier Is	Medlands Beach Backpackers (Owner)	Y	Y																1	Y	QS	
65	30.04.03	Ellerslie	Auckland				Y							1	1	1	1						N	QO	
66	30.04.03		Wellington				Y							1	1								Y	S	
67	30.04.03	Mairangi Bay	Auckland			Y								1								1	Y	S	
68	30.04.03	Farm Cove	Pakuranga				Y								1	1							Y	S	
69	30.04.03		Whitianga				Y							1	1	1	1						N	OO	
70	30.04.03		Clevedon				Y															1	Y	S	
71	30.04.03		Great Barrier Is		Y										1	1						1	Y	S	
72	30.04.03		Great Barrier Is		Y																	1	1	Y	S
73	30.04.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y									1	1							1	N	OO	
74	30.04.03		Leigh				Y															1	N	OO	
75	30.04.03	Whangaparaoa	Auckland	Early Settler Families (Historian)			Y							Y	OC	1						1	1	N	QO

Not required, Quota Management System works. Infringement on basic right of all visitors to fish. Weather protects area. Fish in general are not as plentiful as they used to be so look at commercial usage. Uses areas 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8.		All		Yes
Reserve will benefit area but locals (not just tangata whenua) need to have access for fishing & shellfish gathering.	Part	Area around Waikaro Point.		Yes
Many locals rely on shellfish as part of diet so reserve in that area will not benefit locals.	All			Yes
No benefit to me, should exclude commercial fishers only. Area is food gathering place for locals.	All	Area outside estuary mouth.		Yes
Area is only lightly fished so little benefit of a reserve & a reserve will be a cost to our enjoyment of area.	All	All		Yes
I enjoy collecting seafood in area. DOC can't look after what it has at the moment. Stop commercial fishers instead.	Part	Area from Whangapoua Beach out to behind Rakitu Island.		Yes
Areas for fish to breed.	All	Harotaonga.		Yes
Commercial fishing should be banned all around the island out to 2 miles. Ban scuba seafood hunting & dredging & allow recreational fishing from hand lines only.	All	All		Yes
Area too large. As a local I would like to gather shellfish. Ban scallop dredges & commercial fishing around all of GBI instead.	Part		Area 3, where sea is adjacent to DOC land.	Yes
Protect biodiversity & conserve marine species.				Yes
Not given.				Yes
Reserve would protect a range of habitats. Discussions with iwi may require small areas to be excluded for shellfish gathering.	Part for iwi			Yes
I would benefit by knowing it is there for our marine life.				Yes
I won't benefit but future generations will.				Yes
There is already a reserve at the Poor Knights & another proposed for Tiritiri Matangi - if that is accepted there will be enough in region.				Yes
Unfair to stop boats fishing in area as is the only area on GBI that provides anchorages & shelter in south-west winds.			Little Barrier Island or Mokohinau Islands or the tip of the Coromandel Peninsula.	Yes & letter
Essential for our future. No more reserves after this one for the next 10 years.				Yes
Area is ideal for protection.	Part			Yes
Support reserve somewhere on north-east coast but not current proposal as it is too large. The Quota Management System is the method to maintain fish stocks while reserves should only be used to protect unique areas.		All		Yes
Future generations will benefit. Keep it big.	Part for iwi	None		Yes
Reserve will attract visitors & will establish GBI as worthwhile & accessible venue.				Yes
Improved recreational fishing elsewhere, better diving. I would visit the area if it was a marine reserve. Please ensure the system is not based on race - make it no take for everyone or no one.				Yes
Quota Management System is all we need to manage fish stocks. Proposed area is only safe shelter in south-west winds & I want to keep fishing there.		All	Navy zone.	Yes
I have dived at Goat Island & would like to see this area become like that because it proves marine reserves are necessary. It will benefit future generations.				Yes
Benefit will be knowing I helped protect area for future generations. Let us not leave it too long.				Yes
Everyone will benefit through the preservation & protection of marine ecosystems. Have seen benefits at Leigh.				Yes
Area is too big & Navy zone is already effectively a reserve. Area is a prized boating location with some excellent anchorages.	All		Navy zone with extra if necessary.	Yes
Navy zone & shipping zone are already acting as marine reserves. Quota Management System protects fish stocks already. I have nothing against reserves but one of this size is unrealistic. As a Leigh fisher I know the problems DOC has policing even a small reserve.	Part			Yes & letter
Most of area is inaccessible so should not be a reserve. Ban commercial fishing only.	Part			Yes

76	30.04.03	Glenfield	Auckland 1310			Y	Y				O	1							1							Y	QS	
77	30.04.03	Kohimarama	Auckland					Y			OC									1							Y	S
78	30.04.03	Hillsborough	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1										Y	QS
79	30.04.03	PO Box Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y						OC														1		N	QO
80	30.04.03		Leigh				Y				OC			1	1												N	QO
81	30.04.03	Manurewa	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1												N	OO
82	30.04.03	Epsom	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1												N	OO
83	30.04.03		Whitianga	Landfall Charters (Owner)				Y			O			1			1	1									N	OO
84	30.04.03		Auckland 1230					Y			OC					1											Y	S
85	30.04.03	Takapuna	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1	1										Y	QS
86	30.04.03		Kerikeri 0470			Y					O			1											1		N	OO
87	30.04.03	Beach Haven	Auckland	Propulsion Alternatives Ltd (Managing Director)				Y			O			1	1	1	1										N	OO
88	30.04.03	Pukekohe	Auckland					Y			OC			1			1										N	OO
89	30.04.03	Awana	Great Barrier Is	NZ Defense Force/Navy (Property owner)	Y						O	1		1	1										1		Y	QS
90	30.04.03	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is			Y					O			1											1		N	OO
91	30.04.03	Parnell	Auckland					Y			O			1			1	1									N	OO
92	30.04.03	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is			Y					O			1													N	OO
93	30.04.03	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is	Glenfern Sanctuary (Partner)	Y	Y					O					1											Y	S
94	30.04.03	Papakura	Auckland							Y	O														1		Y	S
95	30.04.03	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC					1	1	1									Y	QS
96	30.04.03	Forest Hill	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1												Y	QS
97	30.04.03	Forest Hill	Auckland					Y			OC					1											Y	S
98	30.04.03	Medlands	Great Barrier Is	Findlay - Medland family (Member)	Y	Y					O	1		1	1	1	1	1									N	OO
99	30.04.03		Whangarei					Y			O			1			1	1									N	OO
100	30.04.03	Pt Chevalier	Auckland					Y			OC						1	1									Y	S
101	1.05.03	Grafton	Auckland					Y			OC			1													Y	S
102	1.05.03	Grafton	Auckland							Y	N														1		Y	S
103	1.05.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is	Coastal Rescue (Harbour Master)	Y	Y					O			1	1	1	1	1	1	1							Y/N	QS
104	1.05.03		Coromandel 2851					Y			O			1													N	QO

Some area should be set aside as it benefits all people. Allow some shellfish gathering & allow fishing from the beach. Area is too large. Surfing & swimming should be permitted as should fishing from the beach.	Part			Yes
Benefit is to future generations. I support objectives of a marine reserve.				Yes
Conservation for future generations & better fishing outside of reserve. Current proposal is too large.	None			Yes
Exploitation of area is from commercial fishers & visitors only so don't stop locals using area.	All			Yes
There will be a negative impact on commercial users such as charter boats. A reserve would make fishing unsafe in some weather conditions.	None	Areas 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8.		Yes
Area not suitable for reserve as only accessible by boat. Enough reserves already.				Yes
Already enough marine reserves. If there is to be a reserve, it should be total - there should be no fishing or shellfish gathering for anyone, regardless of their race.				Yes
Already no-fishing zone adjacent to proposed area. I object to any move by DOC to control coastline as there soon will be no coastline to fish in.	All	All		Yes
Protected zone would bring benefits elsewhere along coast. Sails in area.	None	None		Yes
Supports idea & would also support recreational fishers being allowed restricted access to area.				Yes
If a reserve, the nicest part of GBI will be lost. Teach younger generations to respect the land & not murder Norfolk pines etc. The airstrip at Okiwi must be maintained.	All	All		Yes
Fisheries resources already well managed so no need for marine reserve. Wants continued access for recreational fishing around GBI. Only benefit of a reserve will be to recreational divers. If anything, commercial fishing only should be banned.		All		Yes
Enough marine reserves in the Hauraki Gulf. Added to the Navy zone, this makes an enormous area prohibited already.	All	All		Yes
Would like to see commercial fishing completely excluded but allow some recreational fishing. Concerns about how DOC could police such a reserve.		Areas to allow locals to fish & gather shellfish to supplement their diets.		Yes & letter
Area is a source of food for residents.	All	All		Yes
Wants to gather shellfish & fish for food in area. Totally objects to the proposal, especially to a reserve being established in 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.	All	Areas 2, 3, 4 & area around Rakitu Island.		Yes & letter
Want to keep fishing & collecting shellfish for food.	All	All		Yes
Increased tourism opportunities, greater overseas interest, provide more jobs for locals, research opportunities.				Yes
Involved with island through Great Barrier Airlines & visit every day. We need to preserve what we can. There are plenty of other places to fish.	None	None		Yes
Increased tourism. Part of estuary & area marked on map should be excluded to allow for local harvesting. A research centre should be established for research & education - this would create many opportunities for locals.	Part	Areas 2 & 4.		Yes
Variety & amount of marine life will increase. Shellfish harvesting & inshore fishing areas should be excluded for local use. Scientific research opportunities will benefit local population.	Part for locals	Some inshore areas for local harvesting.		Yes
Increase fish populations, possible education opportunities. Aquaculture establishment.	None	None		Yes
Put all inner Hauraki Gulf into non-commercial fishing area & stop commercial fishing within 12 miles of all NZ. Don't support this reserve as it will stop my recreational fishing. The area is so remote it rejuvenates itself. Who will police such a large area? DOC is unable to control weeds etc on GBI as it is.	All	All		Yes
Area is self regulating so doesn't need protection. DOC is spending too much money & time to bolster their one-sided view. No one can get to the deep reefs to damage them anyway.	All	All		Yes
Increase biodiversity of whole area & spillover into non-reserve areas.	Part for iwi			Yes
Benefit future generations				Yes
None given				Yes
Supports marine reserves & would like to see several around GBI. I think the location is a poor choice to bring the public onsite. Other areas around GBI would be more appropriate.	None		Southern corner of GBI from Rosalie Bay to Rabbit Island.	Yes
At present there are no endangered species here that are affected by commercial fishing & not a lot of pressure from same. Current management systems mean marine reserves are not a fisheries management tool.			Extension of Navy zone area.	Yes

105	5.05.03		Coromandel	Forest & Bird - Upper Coromandel Branch (Secretary)						Not given								Y	S		
106	6.05.03		Not given	Charter launch operator (Owner)			Y			O			1		1	1		1	Y	QS	
107	6.05.03	Waiheke Island	Auckland 1240	Auckland Outdoor Education Association (President)			Y			OC			1		1				Y	S	
108	6.05.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y			OC			1	1	1	1			N	OO	
109	6.05.03	Torbay	Auckland				Y			O		1							Y	QS	
110	1.05.03	Upper Hutt	Wellington							Not given									Y	QS	
111	7.05.03	Okupu RD1	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y			OC			1			1	1		Y	S	
112	7.05.03		Great Barrier Is			Y				OC	1		1		1	1			Y/N	QS	
113	6.05.03	Okupu	Great Barrier Is	Okupu Ridge Dwellers		Y	Y			O	1		1	1		1	1		N	QS	
114	9.05.03	Rocky Bay	Waiheke Island				Y			OC			1	1	1				N	OO	
115	12.05.03	Remuera	Auckland				Y			OC				1				1	Y	S	
116	12.05.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y			OC						1			Y	S	
117	13.05.03	RD1 Tryphena	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y			OC	1						1		Y	S	
118	13.05.03		Great Barrier Is				Y			OC			1	1	1				Y	QS	
119	28.05.03	Glen Innes	Auckland				Y			OC						1			Y	S	
120	28.05.03	Leigh	Warkworth			Y				O		1	1						N	OO	
121	28.05.03	Not given	Not given				Y			OC		1	1	1					N	OO	
122	28.05.03	RD 3	Hamilton			Y				OC				1					Y	S	
123	28.05.03		Hamilton				Y			O			1	1		1			Y	QS	
124	28.05.03		Hamilton				Y			O			1	1	1	1			1	Y	QS
125	28.05.03	Papakura	Auckland						Y	N									Y	S	
126	28.05.03	Port Nelson	Nelson	Nautical Services Ltd (Director)						OC									Y	S	
127	28.05.03	Not given	Not given			Y				OC						1			Y	S	
128	28.05.03		Nelson	Picots Charter Guide (CEO)				Y		N									Y	S	
129	28.05.03	Northcote	Auckland 1310	Smokehouse Bay (Half owner)			Y			O			1	1	1	1			Y	QS	
130	28.05.03	RD 2	Putaruru				Y			OC			1						N	OO	
131	28.05.03		Coromandel				Y			OC		1	1		1				N	OO	
132	28.05.03	Not given	Not given				Y			OC		1	1	1					N	OO	

None given				Letter
Supports marine protection as it provides diving opportunities but wants recreational fishers to have access to area.		Area 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.		Yes
All people benefit. Still a long way to go to reach 10% of NZ's coastline.	None			Yes
Supportive of marine reserves but only in places where people don't live. Whole island should be excluded & another island found for a marine reserve.	All	All		Yes
Opposes some areas because they are commercially fished. Has fished in the area for 25 years & the fact that the sea life is as DOC has found it has demonstrated that we are not damaging the area.		Areas 3, 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 1, 2 & 4.	Yes
Support for marine reserve in principle but thinks it may be too large. Downscale & move boundaries so it is separated from Navy testing area.				Letter
I will not benefit but future generations will.				Yes
Wants areas of estuary & coast to be excluded & says it is too large	Part	Coastal areas 2, 3 & 4.		Yes
Reserve should include some of north-west coast as well but should not include Whangapoua estuary or beach. Fishing needs to be allowed for locals.	All	Areas 1, 2 & 4.	Areas 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8 and also north-west side of GBI.	Yes
Too great a restriction on most recreational activities	All	All		Yes
Marine ecosystem will benefit.	None	None	Areas on western side of GBI including the Broken Islands & Port Fitzroy.	Yes
More biodiversity, fish stocks increase. Will enhance my pleasure at living on the island & my visitors will enjoy a more unique experience.				Yes
Benefit future generations. Should be bigger.	Part			Yes
Will benefit future generations but proposed area is too large & locals need access to estuary & near shore fishing areas.	All	Areas 1 & 2.		Yes
Supports Rakitu Island being included.				Yes
Nowhere around GBI, except Navy zone, should be a marine reserve. Fish & crayfish are not facing extinction here & never will. Make a reserve on west coast instead.			Areas 1 & 2 or the Navy zone or Auckland's West Coast.	Yes
None given				Yes
Marine reserve will make an important contribution to sustaining our natural heritage for future generations.	None	None		Yes
Agree with general benefits as outlined in discussion document. Reserve should finish just south of Whakatautuna Point to allow fishing near Awana & north of Navy zone. Reserve must be effectively policed.	Part	Area south of Whakatautuna Point.		Yes
Good to protect areas "for nature". Fishing from rocks at Korotiti should be allowed & southern boundary should be moved north.		Area south of Whakatautuna Point.		Yes
Supports Goat Island marine reserve & would visit GBI if a reserve was established. The bigger the reserve the bigger the long-term benefits to everyone, including fishermen.				Yes
Agrees with plan as proposed. Has a marine science qualification.				Yes
The island as a whole would benefit. Preservation of a few wild areas in NZ should be considered above the needs of individuals.				Yes
Increase attractiveness for tourists.	None	None		Yes
Will protect coastline from commercial fishing activities. Would like to see less coastline & more offshore waters protected around GBI. Need to ensure anchoring is permitted at Rakitu Island.	None	Areas 3 & 7.	Areas 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 & 8.	Yes
You are locking up areas of NZ coast from fishing.				Yes
Packhorse are in abundance here & recreational fishing is good because of remote setting. Reserve would impact on recreational fishing activity. Have marked areas of use on map.		All		Yes
No benefit.				Yes

133	28.05.03		Greymouth				Y			OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
134	28.05.03	Oratia	Auckland			Y				O			1	1	1	1				N	QO
135	28.05.03		Leigh	Leigh Fishermen's Association			Y			O		1	1					1		N	OO
136	28.05.03	RD 5	Warkworth						Y	N			1	1		1		1		N	QO
137	28.05.03	RD 5	Warkworth			Y				OC			1							N	OO
138	28.05.03		Great Barrier Is	Awana Beachcare Group (Chairperson)						Not given										Y	QS
139	28.05.03	Hillcrest	Auckland				Y			OC			1		1					N	OO
140	22.08.03		Thames	Thames Angling Club (Member)			Y			O			1		1	1				N	OO
141	28.05.03	RD 1	Whitianga	SUNZ (Team leader)					Y	O		1	1		1					Y	QS
142	28.05.03		Whitianga	Ngati Hei			Y			O	1		1	1	1	1				N	OO
143	28.05.03	Pakuranga	Auckland			Y	Y			OC			1	1	1	1				Y/N	QS
144	28.05.03	Tikipunga	Whangarei			Y	Y			O			1	1		1	1			Y	QS
145	28.05.03	Not given	Not given			Y	Y			O			1	1	1	1		1		N	QO
146	28.05.03	Parnell	Auckland			Y		Y		OC			1	1		1				N	QO
147	28.05.03	Birkdale	Auckland			Y	Y			OC						1				Y	QS
148	28.05.03	St Mary's Bay	Auckland					Y		OC				1		1				Y	S
149	28.05.03	Half Moon Bay	Auckland 9	Personal submission			Y			O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
150	28.05.03	Glendowie	Auckland				Y			OC				1						Y	QS
151	28.05.03	Eureka, NSW 2480	Australia			Y				OC						1				Y	QS
152	19.05.03	Northcote	Auckland				Y			OC	1			1						Y	S
153	20.05.03	Hobsonville	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1						Y	S
154	21.05.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				O	1		1			1				N	OO
155	21.05.03		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				OC	1									N	OO
156	21.05.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y					OC	1					1				Y	QS

It is another DOC "grab" of an area. There are already have enough reserves in this area. DOC doesn't pay rates for areas they grab.	All			Yes
Areas/concessions should be made available for sustenance fishing & diving.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 & Rakitu Island.	Area 4.	Yes
Health & safety, my crew will lose their jobs. Also form submission: "I oppose the proposal for the above [Great Barrier Island] marine reserve. There should be no more marine reserves until such time as an overall strategic plan for whole of New Zealand is tabled to the public".				Yes & form letter
Is it really needed there since it is so far away? Is it over-fished? If a reserve is needed it should be nearer the mainland where you have a bigger population who can enjoy swimming with the fish as at Leigh marine reserve.	All			Yes
Not needed because of its isolation. If it were closer it would be different.	All	All		Yes
Support large marine reserve but do not support it being completely no-take. Allow limited non-commercial fishing by local people in some areas. Letter also signed by Jenni Ogden, Amanda Yates, Alan & Sue Grey, Emma Hunt, Andy & Gay Oxborough.	Part			Letter
Because my children & grandchildren should not be restricted from area. Area is sufficiently far away to keep the use minimal.	All	All		Yes
Difficulty finding safe harbour in bad weather with fish on board. A ban on commercial fishing on most shores within the Hauraki Gulf out to 12 mile limit would be more beneficial than marine reserves.	All	All		Yes
Thinks the reserve is too big. He sustainably/rotationally harvests kina in area & has proposed alternative boundaries.		Areas 3, 4 and area around Rakitu Island.	Area from Whakatautuna Point south to include Navy zone.	Yes
Does not support proposal in current form as area is adequately controlled by Ministry of Fisheries regulations & by weather conditions.	All	All		Yes
Area is too large. Concerned about having fish on board inside a marine reserve. DOC thinks a reserve will replenish fish stocks.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 & 8	Area 5	Yes & letter
Would like to see more of coastline & sea protected from commercial fishing. Areas should be left so locals can collect shellfish (as long as they are managed). DOC must increase staff levels to ensure reserve was well managed.	Part	Areas for locals to fish.		Yes
Area needs to be protected but not totally shut off so people can't recreationally use the area. Area should be managed by having closed fishing seasons & no commercial fishing.				Yes
Need to strike a sustainable balance between recreation and pressures on environment. There might be a case for a small marine reserve as suggested by Steering Committee in 1994.	Seasonal	Areas 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Area recommended by Steering Group in mid-1990s (area 4 & part of 5).	Yes & letter
Preserve coastal habitat & wildlife for future generations. Greater abundance of wildlife. Allow access to shellfish beds for local residents.	Part for locals			Yes
Would like to see marine life protected from short-sighted unscrupulous fishing practices.				Yes
No risk or threat to area therefore no benefit. Will erode my access rights to fish & harvest seafood. Estuary is important for locals & visiting boaties & iwi. Need to determine first which species are at risk or under threat prior to determining level of marine protection. Cable protection areas & existing marine protected areas already adequate. This proposal lacks scientific justification.	All		Navy zone.	Yes
More marine life available & a feeling that I have contributed to the public good. Allow some harvesting of shellfish at Whangapoua.	Part			Yes
Allow locals to harvest some shellfish at Whangapoua estuary but need to make sure that you police it properly.	Part	None		Yes
Preservation of fish & marine stocks				Yes
Benefit future generations. The pressure on our coastal resources will only increase and protection is vital. Reserve should be bigger.	None	None		Yes
Marine reserve does not achieve anything, get rid of pollution & have closures on crayfish & fish breeding seasons instead.	All	All		Yes
GBI people should be able to sustainably harvest seafood for sustenance & recreation. Takes up more than 10% of coast which is too much and inconsistent with government policy.	All			Yes
Preserve area in perpetuity. Locals need to be able to gather shellfish.	All	Area 2.		Yes

157	21.05.03	Northcote	Auckland					Y											OC								1										Y	S
158	22.05.03		Great Barrier Is			Y	Y												OC				1				1	1	1	1							Y	QS
159	22.05.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y												OC				1				1									N	OO	
160	23.05.03	Pakuranga	Auckland				Y	Y											O				1	1		1	1	1	1							Y	S	
161	3.6.03		Wellington					Y											OC						1	1										Y	S	
162	3.6.03		Warkworth					Y											OC				1			1										Y	S	
163	3.6.03		Greymouth					Y											OC					1	1											Y	S	
164	3.6.03	Glenfield	Auckland					Y											OC				1	1											N	OO		
165	3.6.03		Waiheke Island					Y											OC				1	1		1	1									Y	QS	
166	3.6.03		Whitianga					Y											O	1			1	1		1	1									Y	QS	
167	3.6.03	Mt Albert	Auckland					Y											O				1	1		1										N	OO	
168	3.6.03	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y												O	1			1												Y	QS		
169	3.6.03	Pakuranga	Auckland					Y											OC								1									Y	S	
170	3.6.03	Gulf Harbour	Whangaparaoa					Y											OC				1			1										N	OO	
171	3.6.03		Not given	Ngati Korora		Y													O	1							1	1								N	QO	
172	3.6.03	Oneroa	Waiheke Island					Y											O				1			1										N	OO	
173	3.6.03		Whitianga	Charter vessel 'MV Whai' (Partner)				Y											O	1			1	1		1	1									Y	QS	
174	3.6.03	Howick	Auckland					Y											OC								1									Y	S	
175	3.6.03	Parnell	Auckland				Y												O				1	1			1									Y	S	
176	3.6.03		Kerikeri	Mabey family (Member)				Y											O	1			1			1	1									Y	QS	
177	3.6.03		Kerikeri					Y											OC				1				1									N	QO	
178	3.6.03	Flat Bush, RD Papatoetoe	Auckland					Y											O				1													N	OO	
179	3.6.03		Great Barrier Is			Y	Y												OC				1	1			1	1								N	OO	
180	3.6.03		Whitianga					Y											OC				1			1										N	OO	
181	3.6.03	Howick	Auckland					Y											OC				1												1	N	OO	

Protect marine resources & biodiversity, this will lead to replenishment of fish varieties and stock. Reserve will demonstrate NZ's commitment for global sustainability & educate the public about the need to create marine reserves in NZ.				Yes
Preservation & recovery of marine life which will enhance fishing and diving around area. Would like to see some areas available for locals to access seafood e.g. reserve broken up or corridors of access allowed.		Small areas for residents to access seafood.		Yes
Other options should be pursued first e.g. no fishing during spawning season, review fishing regulations in general, then worry about the marine reserve.	All			Yes
Protection & increase in marine fauna for present & future generations to see & learn about. Overflow into adjacent areas. Keep it as large as will be accepted & include exposed coast & estuary.	None			Yes
Protection of marine biodiversity.				Yes
Have seen effects of over-fishing & positive effect of marine reserves at Leigh & Poor Knights. Protection of this area will be of benefit as the diving will be magnificent. Think of our children not of ourselves.	None	None		Yes
Conservation of species, better recreational diving & just knowing it will be there for my kids.	None	None		Yes
Not in favour of government's policy on marine reserves.				Yes
More marine life to see when snorkeling. Wants sheltered anchorages excluded so boats can catch a fish for dinner. A total ban on fishing & shellfish gathering is unnatural and unrealistic.	Part	Anchorages & fishing areas marked on map in areas 2, 3, 4 & 5.		Yes
Proposed area is too big but a smaller area would be acceptable.		Areas 3, 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 1, 2, 4, & 5.	Yes
This area is a huge slice of some of best fishing ground near Auckland. Area is remote enough to sustain itself without a reserve.	All	All		Yes
Could improve GBI economy & will improve marine environment. Access to part of pipi bed should be allowed & southern boundary should be at Whakatautuna Pt as it will be easy to see from a boat. Boat launching facility near airfield should be developed.	Part	Area south of Whakatautuna Point.		Yes
Area has great potential for eco-tourism.				Yes
Fish need to migrate to breeding grounds to breed, science in marine reserves shows fish are tame, lazy & do not breed. Starfish are the biggest threat to shellfish.	One rule for all	All	Navy zone.	Yes
My family have been picking kaimoana since before you were born. Leave the estuary & sort out the boys in big boats.	All	Areas 1 & 2.	Areas 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
I don't have any issue with marine reserves but this area has limited access so eco-diving will be limited. I visit area 6-7 times per year by boat & fish & will not visit so often if it is a reserve. Most of the proposal is deep water so what scientific information can be obtained?	One rule for all		Broken Islands.	Yes
Not sure why area is so huge. Include Navy zone & exclude coastline area to allow people to catch fish.	Part	Area 3 & coastal areas.	Navy zone	Yes
More to see when snorkeling. Should allow tangata whenua customary rights in estuary if they ask.	All for iwi use	None		Yes
Improved fishing & reserve will keep area from being over-fished. Will protect general marine environment. Commercial fishing elsewhere around the island also needs to be addressed.	None	None		Yes
My family (Mabeys) surely have a right to recreationally fish on the boundaries of their land, as do other locals. Would support some areas being included but feels it is important to allow locals to continue fishing. Reserve should extend round to Miner's Head.	Part	Areas 1, 2 & 4 & part of 3.	North of Wreck Bay & around to Miner's Head.	Yes
None given			From Wreck Bay north around the Needles to Miner's Head.	Yes
When wind is blowing south-west, west or north-west this place is only area to shelter overnight & only fishing area during day. Would support marine reserves established for 5 year periods then moved.	All	All		Yes
Kaimoana rights, might take jobs away from locals. Should look at fish farming instead. Weather protects the area already.	All	All	Little Barrier Island.	Yes
Should protect south east coast of GBI instead as it is more accessible and there are more species there & species that are rare & worth protecting. Do not want areas 3 & 5 included but do agree that it should be protected from commercial ventures.		Areas 3 & 5.		Yes
I recreationally use the area for land & boat based fishing including game fishing & would feel disadvantaged if I could not fish here. If specific species need protecting should protect via quota or ban. Would support a marine park.				Yes

182	3.6.03	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							O			1	1	1	1																				N	OO									
183	3.6.03	Tryphena R D	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							O			1	1		1																						N	OO							
184	3.6.03	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							OC						1	1	1																				Y	QS							
185	3.6.03		Thames				Y						O			1	1																										N	OO					
186	3.6.03	Newton	Auckland				Y						OC																														Y	S					
187	3.6.03	Whangarei	Whangarei	Department of Conservation (employee)			Y		Y				OC						1	1																							Y	S					
188	3.6.03	Paerata	Auckland		Y								O			1	1																											N	OO				
189	3.6.03		Great Barrier Is			Y							O	1																														N	QO				
190	3.6.03		Auckland				Y						OC			1																													Unsure	QO			
191	3.6.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y	Y						O	1	1																														N	OO			
192	3.6.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is	Maori Women's Welfare League (Member)	Y	Y							Not given																																N	OO			
193	3.6.03	RD4	Kaitia	Ngati Wai	Y	Y							OC			1																													N	QO			
194	28.05.03	Orakei	Auckland			Y							OC			1	1	1																													Y	S	
195	3.06.03	Orewa		Orewa Sportfishing Club			Y						OC			1																														Y	QS		
196	9.06.03		Auckland				Y						OC			1	1	1																													Y	QS	
197	9.06.03	Ruawai	Northland			Y							O			1																															Y	QS	
198	9.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							OC			1	1	1	1	1																											N	OO	
199	6.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							OC																																			N	OO
200	5.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							O			1	1																															Y	QS
201	5.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							O	1		1	1																															N	OO
202	Undated	RD1 Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							OC																																			Y	S

Whangapoua estuary has been my back door for 6 generations.	All			Yes
No benefit. I use the area as a food supply.	All			Yes
If a marine reserve helps preserve the area then it is beneficial. Would like to see a small area to be excluded as a taiapure to allow locals to fish & gather shellfish.	None	Area 2 - between Waikaro Point & south end of Whangapoua Beach & out to Rakitu protected as a taiapure.	Areas 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
Fish for a living in that area up to 8 months per year. Quota Management System is enough to manage the fishery. Fishing has never been so good. Weather conditions protect the area already. We catch John Dory, gurnard, snapper, tarakihi & trevally in Area 8 & if we were unable to fish there our annual income would be cut by 30 percent.		Area 8 as catch a lot of my annual fish take there.		Yes
Knowledge that a special area is protected, thus protecting marine biodiversity. Consideration should be given to extending the outward extent if this could protect the feeding grounds of the black petrel.	None			Yes
Knowledge that an area of ocean will be not be harvested is enough benefit aside from potential study & research possible in such a place.	Part for iwi	None		Yes
Area is self regulating due to being very exposed. Shellfish take is governed by fisheries regulations.	All	Whangapoua Beach & Waikaro Point (Area 2).		Yes
Unless there are good rules to manage all fisheries a marine reserve is useless.	All		Area marked on map - from Rakitu south & including Harotaonga.	Yes
Stated that he may be supportive of a marine reserve.				Yes
Totally oppose this or other marine reserves for GBI. Little Barrier Island is the place for a reserve. DOC already has enough land on the Barrier that it cannot look after so why do they want to move on to take the water & take away our recreational fishing & shellfish gathering areas? I would like DOC to justify the reasons for take such a large area. I have commercially fished on the island for last 20 years & don't need DOC or anyone else to police this area as it is well looked after by weather conditions.			Little Barrier Island.	Yes & letter
None given				Yes
Area far too large. Make sure the estuary is completely excluded, keep commercial fishing out & have smaller marine reserve instead.	All			Yes
I am a keen fisher but want all marine ecosystems preserved for future. Would like fishing areas excluded but am happy if they are not.	None			Yes
Reserve will increase crayfish numbers & fish stocks. Exclude some areas for sheltered anchorages & fishing. Need to ensure reserves do not conflict with users safety & enjoyment too much.		Areas 1, 2, 4, 5 & 8 & north-eastern tip.	Areas 3, 6 & 7 (between Waikaro Point & north of Wreck Bay).	Yes
Will preserve environment & act as nursery for the non-reserve area around the reserve. Believe recreational fishing & diving does not impact too greatly on area as it is exposed. Suggests reserve should have following rules: not commercial fishing, not nets, no long lines. Wants some areas excluded & reduce catch limits by half in other area.	All	Area marked on map which includes areas 1, 2, 3 & 4.	Areas 5, 6, 7 & 8 but with some recreational take allowed.	Yes & letter
Support the idea but residents need to catch fish & use estuary & surrounding waters.	All	Areas 1, 2, 4, & 5.	Area 3 plus north-western end of GBI around to Miner's Head.	Yes
DOC are a waste of taxpayer money & need to look after land before they look at ocean areas. None of it needs protecting & weather protects the area fine. DOC should leave marine protection to Ministry of Fisheries.	All	All		Yes
Too big.				Yes
A marine reserve in Harataonga area would be easily accessible & would draw tourists to area. Would like to see commercial fishing reviewed in other parts of proposed area.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Small reserve around Harotaonga & out to Rakitu Island.	Yes
A marine reserve is not needed - should have a marine park with no commercial activities instead.				Yes
Increased tourism therefore more employment & work. Increased fish stocks in other parts of GBI. Learn more about wildlife in area & feel good about protecting small part of global environment.				Yes

Have been visiting area since 1968 in my yacht & are frequent visitors. The fish we catch there forms a staple part of our diet. Have an extensive knowledge of area. Strongly opposed to a marine reserve in this area as it will not benefit environment & will force fishermen to move to other, less suitable areas. Local residents will be greatly affected. The area is protected by weather. The are captures too much of GBI's coastline. The reserve could not be policed. Area is not over fished. Trawling in area should cease. Other commercial craft should be licensed. There is not synergy between DOC & Ministry of Fisheries. There are better alternatives e.g. Cuvier Island.		None	Cuvier Island or rocky coast between Medlands & Rosalie Bay.	Letter
Recreational fisher in area for 11 years & have seen catch become smaller so think it is important to protect areas. Also think it will benefit tourism.				Yes & letter
Does not support proposal in current format. Would like to see commercial & charter boats excluded from some areas & locals be allowed to catch limited amounts of fish & shellfish.				Yes
Because we frequently gather shellfish & fish there.	All			Yes
What about our picnics & taking our relations & visitors? How can we go pipi & cockle gathering? No benefit.	Part			Yes
Supports the idea in principle but would prefer previous proposal.	All	Areas 2, 3, 5 & 7.	Area 4 & out to Rakitu.	Yes
Proposal will create a special environment long-term that may provide eco-tourism benefits. Would like to see southern boundary changed.			Area south of Whakatautuna Point.	Yes
Too isolated & only the privileged would be able to appreciate it. Need to prove the reasons for the proposal. Concerned about not being able to take fish caught outside reserve through the area.				Yes
Will allow kids can still catch a snapper & see them in a natural environment.				Yes
There are enough reserves already & I will lose some of my recreational fishing rights. Benefits would be protection from commercial fishing. I believe the boundaries should be set after consultation with all those interested parties affected. I would like to know the scientific reasons behind the decision for any location and the features and benefits available to each section of the community prior to the decisions as to areas and boundaries. All information considered in the evaluation process by DOC should be made available to the public.				Yes & Option 4
Will mean there is less illegal fishers taking from our coastline.				Yes
Will support marine reserves only when my rights as a recreational fisher is stated in law. Maori customary rights are stated in law & I reject being treated as a second-class citizen.				Yes
It is crucial this reserve be established because: there is not enough of NZ coastline protected at present, a marine reserve close to the large Auckland population is particularly valuable, the proposed area contains some of the most pristine waters in NZ, many people will benefit, the size of the proposal means it will protect a wider variety of marine habitat & life & boundary effects will be less pronounced.				Letter
Believe area suggested is too large & should only extend 3 miles from shore & have the balance as a marine park. Think proposal will help fish stocks recover & prevent damage to ecosystem.	Part	Area between 3 & 12 nautical miles should be a marine park.	Area between coast & 3 nautical miles out should be a marine reserve.	Yes
Support reserve in area between Needles & Waikaro Point only. Boating anchorages need to be excluded.		Areas 2, 4 & 5.	Area 3 & 7.	Yes
Support the proposal if area is reduced. Reserve too big & unworkable as proposed. Popular anchorages need to be excluded. Support area from Needles to Waikaro Point being a reserve.	Part	Areas 2, 4 & 5.	Areas 3 & 7.	Yes
Was a childhood resident on island. The island and visitors will benefit but you are aiming too big as it will be hard to enforce. Not fair to stop residents & visitors fishing in area. Would support a smaller reserve.	Part			Yes
This is too good a chance to miss. Proposal would protect a range of habitats. It would provide a special place to enjoy a diverse environment managed together. Priority should be given to areas 1, 2, 4 & 5.	None		Priority should be given to areas 1, 2, 4 & 5.	Yes
None provided.				Letter
More balanced mix of take vs. no-take use of coast. Need to move towards sustainable management for everyone to survive. Should be taiapure in part of estuary. Ensure co-management with iwi.	Part			Yes
I will not benefit but future generations will. Waters close to land & around Arid Island should not be in marine reserve & should be left for sustenance fishing for residents. A taiapure could be put in place in these areas.	All	Areas 1, 2, 4, 5 & part of 3 - may be protected taiapure.	Areas 3, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes

224	12.06.03	Birkdale	Auckland			Y													O			1				1						Y	QS	
225	12.06.03	RD6	Thames																OC			1	1	1	1							N	OO	
226	12.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													O			1			1	1						N	OO	
227	12.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													O			1	1	1	1							N	OO	
228	12.06.03	Awana Beach	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													OC							1						Y	S	
229	12.06.03		New Plymouth																OC			1		1						1	Y	QS		
230	12.06.03	Kohimarama	Auckland								Y								N												Y	S		
231	12.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y														O			1				1						N	OO	
232	12.06.03	Kaihu	Dargaville			Y	Y												O			1	1	1	1							N	QO	
233	12.06.03	Murrays Bay	Auckland 1311				Y												O			1	1	1	1							N	OO	
234	12.06.03	Weymouth	Auckland					Y											OC	1		1	1	1	1					1		N	QO	
235	12.06.03	Prince's Wharf	Auckland 1001				Y												O			1	1	1	1							Y	QS	
236	12.06.03	Waimauku RD1	Auckland	Pioneer family (descendant)	Y														O	1		1			1							N	OO	
237	12.06.03	RD1 Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													O	1		1	1									N	OO	
238	12.06.03		Te Puke					Y											OC			1				1						Y	QS	
239	12.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is	Ratepayer (President)	Y	Y													O	1		1				1						N	QO	
240	12.06.03		Auckland					Y											N													Y	S	
241	12.06.03		Coromandel					Y											OC						1	1			1			Y	S	
242	12.06.03		Warkworth				Y												O			1			1	1							N	OO
243	12.06.03	Awana	Great Barrier Is	Personal submission															Not given														Y	QS
244	12.06.03	Mt Albert	Auckland					Y											OC			1				1							N	OO

Increased marine life & great for diving & snorkeling. Tourism industry may benefit & transport to island may improve. Commercial fishing has taken toll on marine life. Would expect fishing pressure to increase elsewhere if this reserve was established. Good to have some land-based fishing areas excluded.	None	Small areas for land-based fishing such as point at southern mouth of estuary & north side of Waikaro Point.		Yes
Area is remote & benefits are few. Fishing pressure is light but important to those with the ability to get there. Would exclude ability to feed myself with kaimoana. There is some merit in marine reserves but this proposal is too vast.				Yes
DOC can't look after what land they have now.				Yes
No benefit. Total objection.				Yes
Improve fish life & snorkeling would be more interesting. Put the needs of the environment first.				Yes
Don't use reserves as a fisheries management tool. Need to fix fisheries management not use reserves as a band-aid. Would like areas with access excluded for shore fishers.		Anywhere with access for shore fishermen.		Yes
Preserve marine life & habitats.				Yes
DOC already own enough land on GBI let alone the sea.				Yes
Do not agree to a reserve of this size. Locals have a right to fish, dive, boat & gather seafood in area.	All	Areas 2 & 4 out as far as Rakitu Island.	Areas 3, 6 & 7 out to the 12 nautical mile limit & around the northern end of GBI to Miner's Head.	Yes
Area is not under pressure. I have boated there for 40 yrs & have never seen more than 20 boats in area. There is no scientific evidence that a reserve is needed in this area. Goat Island only has a lot of fish as people feed them. Proposal would ruin some of the best cruising grounds.	All			Yes
It is wrong to deny NZ citizens who lawfully recreationally fish access to an area. No scientific basis to protect this area as it isn't broken by recreational fishers. Commercial trawling may need to be stopped or quotas reduced to protect species as necessary. I fish for game fish in this area. Try a marine park as is being proposed for Auckland's west coast.	Part	Areas deeper than 30 metres (includes areas 5, 6, 7 & 8).	Areas 1, 2, 3 & 4.	Yes
Increased marine life. Suggests areas to be excluded because they are popular anchorages & people should be allowed to fish there.		Popular anchorages including Harotaonga, area south of Waikaro Point & Wreck Bay.		Yes
I should be able to harvest fish & shellfish where & when I want. DOC already have enough control. Who is going to enforce area?	All	All	Little Barrier Island.	Yes
Area has natural shelter & any restriction will endanger human life. No evidence that marine reserves benefit humans. Proper management of quota & limits is answer to continued fish stocks & breeding.	All	All		Yes
Support marine reserves but total blanket effect is not answer. Try banning netting of any type & reduce commercial industry.		Areas 4, 5 & 8.	Areas 1, 2, 3, 6 & 7 plus area on north-west side as far as Miner's Head.	Yes
Put reserve where DOC owns land i.e. Miners Head area. DOC lacks money & expertise to police a reserve.	All		Miner's Head area.	Yes
Reserves are small refuges for the diverse biodiversity that probably existed. This allows ecological stability & benefits us all. Seems to be a lack of understanding by public & fishers about how they will benefit - I would like to see more PR work here.				Yes
Through scientific interest, increased recreational benefit (snorkeling & diving). Increased fishing success outside of reserve.	None	None		Yes
You are taking away my rights. I have been visiting GBI for past 34 years & used to fish extensively (commercially). Area is remote & protected by weather. The Quota Management System is the tool to protect fish species. Navy zone already acts as a reserve. Let Ministry of Fisheries rule the sea & DOC stay with the land. Proposed area is only safe area when wind blows south-east to north-west.	All	All	Navy zone.	Yes & letter
Strongly support proposal but take issue with 3 aspects: proposed boundaries, suggestion of different rights for iwi in estuary & premise that reserves must be totally no-take. Boundary should wrap around northern tip of GBI & go further south to include Awana. Estuary - both iwi & non-iwi should have some limited seasonal take granted. Should be a system of permissions for local people to take limited quantities of fish for food.	Seasonal		Include Awana Bay & extend reserve around tip of GBI to include some north-western habitat.	Letter
Existing commercial & recreational fishing regulations are enough to protect area. Reserve of this size would put pressure on other areas.	All	All		Yes

245	12.06.03	RD1	Great Barrier Is	Forest & Bird (secretary)	Y	Y				Y	O			1		1			1	Y	QS
246	12.06.03	Howick	Auckland			Y					O			1		1	1			N	OO
247	12.06.03	Glenfield	Auckland				Y				OC			1		1	1		1	Y	S
248	12.06.03	Wellesley St	Auckland				Y				OC					1				Y	S
249	9.06.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland			Y					O			1	1	1	1			N	OO
250	12.06.03	Pakuranga	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1		1			Y	QS
251	17.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC			1			1	1	1	N	OO
252	17.06.03	Greenmount	Auckland			Y					OC			1	1	1	1			N	OO
253	17.06.03	Bayswater Marina	Auckland			Y					O			1	1	1	1	1		Y	S
254	17.06.03	Chapel Park	Manukau				Y				OC			1	1	1	1			Y	S
255	17.06.03		Auckland 5				Y				OC				1		1			Y	S
256	17.06.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland	Pro Dive (Yachtsman)			Y				OC			1	1	1	1			N	OO
257	17.06.03	Howick	Auckland			Y					OC			1		1	1			Y	S
258	17.06.03	Halfmoon Bay	Auckland			Y					OC				1	1	1		1	Y	S
259	17.06.03	Pakuranga	Auckland			Y					OC			1	1		1			N	QO
260	17.06.03	Eastern Beach	Auckland				Y				OC				1		1			Y	S
261	17.06.03		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O			1			1			Not given	QS
262	17.06.03	Tryphena R D 1	Great Barrier Is	Happy Oasis	Y						O				1	1	1		1	Y	S
263	17.06.03	Manurewa	Auckland				Y				OC				1				1	Y	S
264	17.06.03	Awana Bay	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O						1			Y	S
265	17.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC			1			1			Y	S
266	17.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC			1			1			Y	QS
267	17.06.03	Titirangi	Auckland				Y				OC			1		1	1			N	OO
268	17.06.03		Warkworth				Y		Y		OC			1			1	1		Y	S

Protection of land & seascapes. Concerns about how area will be policed. Also thinks reserve should be able to be reviewed/opened in future.	Part			Yes
Don't like the location. I would lose my freedom - it's nice to have shellfish & fish. DOC should control commercial fishing in the first instance.	All		The north-western area of GBI.	Yes
All the benefits mentioned in document. Reserve would be a treasure to not only GBI community but to NZ as a whole. Advantages will far outweigh perceived detrimental effects that a marine reserve would bring.	None	None		Yes
Recovery of habitat & returning wildlife would improve diving. I am establishing a dive guiding business & think a reserve would attract visitors to area. New marine species found every day in NZ which indicates we have imperfect knowledge. Potential for economic benefits would outweigh having to travel further to fish.				Yes
I am happy as it is now. No benefit.	All			Yes
Supportive as long as rules apply to all people, including tangata whenua. If iwi are exempt I will strongly oppose reserve.				Yes
If commercial fishers were prevented from using area there would be no need for protection policies. Reserve would prevent my family picnicking, using beaches, recreational fishing, swimming, walking, making sand castles, painting & shellfish collecting. It would be sad to stop families using the coastline & recreational fishing.	All	All		Yes
Weather & distance from mainland keeps use down. It is a huge area to block out. Any regulation should apply to commercial activities not recreational.	All	All		Yes
Security for fragile area, enhance diving, overflow of fish into other areas, maintained for future generations. Auckland area has the largest pressure on resources so it should have the maximum amount of reserves.	None	None		Yes
Better marine life in general. Reasonable improvement requires 10-20% of total NZ fisheries to be left as reserves.	None	None		Yes
Protect & improve area for current family & for future generations.				Yes
Not practical, the weather controls the area, area covers 4 main anchorages. Not enforceable. Proposal is anti-boating. Commercial fishing has affected this area, not recreational.	All	Anchorages, safe dive anchoring sites, fishing areas - basically the coastline & reefs.		Yes
Please preserve an important & un-spoilt place of beauty. It would be a great asset for GBI & NZ.	None	None		Yes
Would agree to some taking of shellfish by locals if evidence of sustainability is available.	Part			Yes
Area is only lightly recreationally fished. I would agree with a much smaller area or ban on commercial fishing. Have been a regular visitor to area for past 20 years & have never seen any amount of over fishing, habitat damage or other negative impact from fishing.		All		Yes
All NZ will benefit as it is part of our heritage.	None	None		Yes
Supports the area marked on map.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 & 8.	Area from Komahunga Bay out to 12 nautical miles & south to include Navy zone.	Yes
Better snorkeling, improved area for tourists, environmental benefits & satisfaction of preserving life for future generations. Reserve will enhance fishing, property values & quality of life on island in future.	None			Yes
It will benefit all New Zealanders. The more reserves around our coast, the better for future generations.	All	None		Yes
Preserve a little of our marine environment for the future. Awana Bay should be included in a marine reserve.	Seasonal		Awana Bay	Yes
Good for future generations. Problems in Hauraki Gulf have been caused by over fishing & commercial methods so this needs addressing at same time.				Yes
Future generations will benefit. Need to ensure locals have access for subsistence fishing. Proposal does not address issues of over fishing from commercial use or pollution.				Yes
This is one of the few places left in NZ where we can fish & will catch them. Island is remote enough, especially in winter months so you don't need to ban fishers/divers from gathering food.	All	All		Yes
Marine ecologist. Reserve will protect ecosystem & wide range of habitats & species. Would support some areas being available for subsistence harvesting in estuary & coastal areas.	Part	Areas for locals to catch a fish.		Yes

269	17.06.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland				Y											OC				1				1				N	OO
270	17.06.03	RD 2	Warkworth				Y	Y										O								1				Y	S
271	17.06.03	Avondale	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1	1	1					N	OO
272	17.06.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1	1	1					Unsure	QS
273	17.06.03	Avondale	Auckland				Y	Y										OC								1				Y	QS
274	17.06.03	RD 1	Hamilton 1006				Y											O				1			1	1				Y	QS
275	17.06.03	North Shore Mail Centre	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1		1					N	QO
276	17.06.03	RD 3	Warkworth	Forest & Bird - Mid-North Branch (Deputy Chair) & The Tree Council (Hon Secretary)				Y										N												Y	S
277	17.06.03	Pigeon Post	Great Barrier Is															Not given												N	OO
278	17.06.03	RD Okupu	Great Barrier Is	Rural Women & Okupu Residents & Ratepayers (secretary for both)	Y	Y												OC							1					N	QO
279	11.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y											O	1			1	1	1	1					N	OO
280	1.09.03	Te Atatu North	Auckland					Y										OC												Y	S
281	13.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is			Y												OC	1			1	1	1	1					N	OO
282	13.06.03	Ellerslie	Auckland					Y										O				1	1	1	1					Y	QS
283	17.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y											Not given												N	OO
284	17.06.03	RD1	Great Barrier Is															Not given												N	OO
285	17.06.03	Awana	Great Barrier Is	Awana Beachcare Group (members)	Y	Y												OC							1					N	QO
286	16.06.03	RD2 Albany	Auckland	Okura River Boating Club														Not given												Y	QS

Present regulations take care of area sufficiently. Reserve will not benefit the majority of people who use the area.				Yes
Good for the future health of marine environment - will allow fish & marine life to regain balance & sufficient breeding area for all fish. Might be more appropriate to have 2 reserves with a fishing zone in between rather than one large reserve. We must have reserves on at least 10% of all NZ coastline.	Part	Area marked on map to allow for fishing.		Yes
Area is remote so the amount humans use it does adversely affect the ecology. It is unlikely to be overrun due to remoteness & sea conditions.				Yes
Not sure about DOC's overall strategy & motives so not sure if I support it. Fish and marine populations will probably benefit but I won't. Concerned about commercial plundering of game fish e.g. tuna, marlin, broadbill. Boaties must be able to pass through a reserve with fish on board. Am skeptical of DOC's agenda & integrity.	None			Yes
Knowledge of sea life will improve & tourism potential, which could boost GBI's economy. The need to care for our environment & side-effects if we don't. Does need to be some food gathering areas for locals.	Part for locals	Food gathering areas for locals.		Yes
Proposed area too large & if it goes ahead I will lose something I have enjoyed for 20 years. Supports areas marked on map. Collection of shellfish should be allowed to be continued on a limited basis.	Seasonal	Areas 1, 2, 4, & 5 to be open to land-based fishing only.	Areas 3 & 7 plus north-western area around to Miner's Head.	Yes
Marine reserve as proposed will infringe on peoples' natural rights. Area should be managed so it includes people of NZ's normal & natural rights. Manage, don't dictate. Select an identifiable area like Rakitu Island & 1000 metres out.		Area should be smaller e.g. Rakitu Is & 1km around island.		Yes
Logical extension of Northland & North Auckland coastline reserves. We support all efforts to set aside appropriate coastline as reserves for marine life & especially like to see coastal reserves on land extended out to sea.				Yes
It is not needed as over-fishing & siltation are the main causes of marine degradation & the proposal does not address these. A ban on fishing methods in Hauraki Gulf in conjunction with Quota Management System would be more effective. I don't trust DOC - DOC has a poor reputation on GBI which is based on many years of managing their affairs in a manner contrary to the needs of the community.				Yes & letter
Support the principle of marine reserves but not this one. There is a history of DOC interference with GBI on land. DOC should lobby Ministry of Fisheries to ban all commercial fishing from around GBI, as this is what causes damage to our oceans.	All	Area 2.		Yes
No confidence in DOC's ability to manage a marine reserve of this size & don't trust their motives.				Yes
Protect if from marine farming & over fishing.				Yes
It does not benefit people in any significant way.				Yes
Supports a reserve in the estuary only & also supports commercial fishing being banned for 12nm around all of GBI.	None	Areas 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Whangapoua estuary only in a reserve.	Yes
None given				Yes
We reject the proposal in its entirety.				Yes
Do not support it as it only touches on problem of over-exploitation of whole marine area. Concerned about pressure on Awana if marine reserve goes ahead. All of the waters around GBI should be protected from any kind of netting & commercial fishing. Concerned about fishing in waterways on GBI & stripping of shellfish beds.	One rule for all			Yes
The Okura River Boating Club was an active advocate of the Long Bay marine reserve & endorses the desirability of man more reserves around the coastline. We support the proposal but would like boundaries to be altered - think only half of Rakitu Island should be included & believe an area on west coast of GBI would be good for a reserve as well.	All	Areas 1, 4, 5 & 8 (area south of a line halfway across Rakitu Island).	Areas 2, 3, 6 & 7 (area north of a line halfway across Rakitu Island).	Letter

287	16.06.03	c/o Okiwi Post Office	Great Barrier Is	Ngati Rehua, Ngati Wai ki Aotea	Y		Y				O	1								N	OO	
288	18.06.03	RD2 Drury	Auckland				Y				O	1		1	1	1	1				N	OO
289	18.06.03	Remuera	Auckland			Y					OC						1			Y	S	
290	18.06.03	Okupu	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O	1		1	1	1	1				N	OO
291	18.06.03	Greenlane	Auckland	Arid Island farm (lessee)	Y				Y		O	1							1	Y	QS	
292	18.06.03	Whangaparaoa	Auckland				Y				O			1		1	1		1		N	OO
293	18.06.03	Te Atatu Peninsula	Auckland				Y				OC			1		1					N	OO
294	18.06.03	Birkenhead	Auckland								Not given										N	OO
295	19.06.03	Ponsonby	Auckland				Y				OC					1	1			Y	S	
296	19.06.03	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC	1		1	1		1				Y/N	QS
297	19.06.03	RD 2	Warkworth			Y					OC	1		1		1	1				N	OO
298	20.06.03	Pakuranga	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
299	20.06.03		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC			1	1				1		N	OO
300	20.06.03	North Shore	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1			Y	S	
301	23.06.03	Huapai	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
302	23.06.03		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O								1		N	OO

Regularly visit the north-east of GBI to exercise customary rights in relation to the sustainable gathering of fish & shellfish. Support marine conservation but not marine reserves as they erode iwi customary rights. Concerned DOC is going to erode our customary rights by proposing a marine reserve as such proposal will not allow us to continue sustainable use of fish & shellfish resources. The areas that provide these resources are: Whangapoua estuary & beach (flounder, mullet, shellfish, surf-cast fishing), Needles to Waikaro Point (surf-cast fishing), estuary to Whakatautuna Point (rock fishing), estuary to Whakatautuna Point (paua & kina), Rakitu Island (boat fishing), inshore sediment areas (scallops), offshore sediment areas (tuna & marlin).	All	All		Letter
GBI is almost a reserve because of its isolation. Ban commercial fishing instead & revisit commercial catch management system. Why not try no fishing during spawning season? In a reserve situation, amateur fishers are penalized. Concern about DOC's ability to police a reserve.				Yes & letter
We will all benefit long-term from such a reserve. It will beautify the area.				Yes
Marine reserves are good in principle but not this proposal as the size is too big. More regulations should be in place for commercial & recreational fishers e.g. limits during spawning season, harsher laws, more Ministry of Fisheries boats to police existing fishing regulations. Reserves should be smaller & more manageable. Locals should be able to gather shellfish.	All	All	Port Fitzroy, Little Barrier Island, Mokohinau Islands.	Yes
Support marine reserves as they safeguard marine seafood to allow replacement breeding cycles. It is important that residents of Rakitu Island have access to small areas to catch seafood as they rely on this for food. Rakitu Island is isolated & often subject to long periods of bad weather, which greatly restricts the access for delivery of stores. Seafood is the prime requirement for sustenance & well-being of the people who live on the island.		Detailed map attached which shows 2 small areas on east & north-west side of Rakitu Island to be excluded to allow for food gathering.		Yes & letter
Because when the new marine reserve legislation is passed, boundaries may be changed without consultation. I feel the area mentioned could be successfully preserved for all if commercial fishing only was excluded. If you must make a marine reserve, it would be unfair to deny local residents from harvesting food for themselves.				Yes
Area is so remote it doesn't need protection as a marine reserve. The under-handed way this proposal was advertised is preposterous.	All			Yes
None provided.				Fax
Better snorkeling with more fish in the reserve, better fishing outside reserve due to fish stock depletion				Yes
Support reserve if it does not affect privately owned areas & access can be guaranteed to locals. It should be only where DOC currently have control of land. If the government was doing its job, a marine reserve would not be needed as Ministry of Fisheries would control area through Quota Management System.	All	All	Areas adjacent to DOC land (area 3).	Yes
The need for a reserve has not been established, area is a natural reserve due to isolation, DOC has ostracized itself from GBI locals, locals should manage land & sea at GBI, I don't want to be prevented from shellfish gathering & fishing in this area.	All	All		Yes
Not necessary. More appropriate to stop commercial ventures & leave the public to use the natural resources as they wish. Stop punishing public for the results of commercialism that the government promoted.				Yes
Not convinced reserves serve any useful purpose but just restrict freedoms and access to a valuable fishing area.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.		Yes
More interesting diving, reserve will enhance sustainability of recreational fishing elsewhere near GBI. It is a marine equivalent of National Park close to Auckland that will provide future recreational activities.	None	None		Yes
It will take away opportunities for recreational & commercial fishers & divers in certain weather conditions to have safe access to activities. Rock fishermen need varied areas so they can fish in all types of conditions. It is naive to think such an area could be policed - police existing laws instead. A marine reserve would benefit if in an area that is accessible e.g. Maraetai or Omana.	All	All	Areas that people can access e.g. Maraetai, Omana or extend Long Bay or Leigh marine reserves.	Yes
Unnecessary as coast already protected by marine management legislation, Ministry of Fisheries etc. There are no benefits & restrictions will mainly affect locals. Sensible use of fisheries legislation is required.	All	All		Yes

303	23.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													O			1																N	OO		
304	23.06.03	Howick	Auckland				Y												O			1	1	1														N	QO		
305	23.06.03		Wanganui			Y													OC						1													Y	S		
306	23.06.03	Howick	Auckland				Y												OC			1	1	1	1														N	QO	
307	25.06.03		Takaka 7172																Not given																				N	OO	
308	25.06.03	Mairangi Bay	Auckland				Y												Not given				1																N	OO	
309	16.06.03		Orewa				Y												OC																				Y	QS	
310	25.06.03	Orakei	Auckland					Y											OC			1				1													Y	S	
311	25.06.03		Rotorua			Y													OC	1		1	1	1	1														N	OO	
312	25.06.03	Awana	Great Barrier Is	Port Fitzroy Fuel (owner)	Y	Y													OC							1													Y	S	
313	25.06.03		Great Barrier Is		Y														OC	1		1	1				1												N	OO	
314	25.06.03	Whangaparapara	Great Barrier Is	Taurehere o Aotea (member)	Y	Y													OC			1				1														N	OO
315	25.06.03	Orua Lane, RD1	Whitianga	Whitianga-Coromandel Peninsula Fisherman Association (President)			Y												O		1	1			1	1													N	OO	
316	24.06.03	National Park Village	Ruapehu				Y												O			1																		N	QO
317	24.06.03	Medlands Beach	Great Barrier Is		Y														O	1		1	1	1	1															N	QO
318	24.06.03	Medlands Beach	Great Barrier Is		Y														O	1		1	1	1	1															N	QO
319	24.06.03	Manurewa	Auckland				Y												OC							1														N	OO

Waste of time and money, too large an area to control. Ministry of Fisheries must do its job e.g. ban trawlers from breeding grounds in Hauraki Gulf then we won't need marine reserves.	All	All		Yes
Why not around Arid Island or the Mokohinau Islands? More effort needed to enforce current controls. Immigrants are the problem.			Area 5 (Arid Island) or the Mokohinau Islands.	Yes
Long held belief a reserve is necessary adjunct to protected areas on land. Will preserve area for future generations. Will protect a full range of habitats. Area is relatively isolated & not greatly used so not too many people will be adversely affected. Support the inclusion of Whangapoua estuary.	None	None		Yes & letter
I made positive suggestions in 1991 but new proposal is too vast & I can't support it. Have been visiting area twice annually for last 35 years. Area doesn't need protecting as it is lightly fished & fishing has improved in recent years. Safest anchorages (Harataonga & Waikaro Point) must be excluded to ensure safety of boats.	All	Safe anchorages at Harataonga & Mabey's (west of Waikaro Point).	2 options that include areas 5 & 8 are marked on map.	Yes & letter
Apparently the consultation by DOC has been minimal.				Email
Regular boating visitor for more than 40 years & can't recall many occasions when weather made much of the coastline unusable for fishing & diving. Marine reserve would be a loss to recreational fishing, which only has minor impacts on the marine life. DOC should focus on commercial fishing. Area provides safe anchorages in south-westerly winds.				Letter
Locals have advised me of poor catches currently. Fishing would improve. Support limited monitored catch for locals.				Letter
The size of the area is important as reserve should be used for study to determine how other areas may benefit from being marine reserves. Preferable to have reserves which will not affect the majority of recreational fishers.	Part for iwi	None		Yes
Caretakers are tangata whenua & locals. A local should be employed to police limited quotas which should always be in place. The reserve removes peoples rights to access these areas. To take away customary rights of tangata whenua is a total breach of ensuring equality in our nation.	All			Yes
All NZ will benefit, fish stocks will increase. DOC is only requiring a small portion of total coastline. Resources available in reserve, including shellfish, are available elsewhere on GBI. Have worked on Port Fitzroy wharf for 5 years & have seen the results of over fishing on GBI. A reserve could increase tourism.	None	None		Yes
Make whole Hauraki Gulf a marine park, get rid of commercial fishermen. Concerned that non-GBI people are having a say on proposal.			Entire Hauraki Gulf should be protected against commercial fishing.	Yes
Reserve should be somewhere else with easier public access such as Waiheke. Islanders must retain rights to fish and collect shellfish for sustenance & culture. Commercial fishing is an issue. Navy area already excludes users.	All	All	Waiheke Island.	Yes
Necessary protection for fish stocks is assured by Quota Management System, Resource Management Act, Fisheries Act & Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act. Already have the Naval testing area protected. We reject marine reserves enhance and protect fish. Have not been given a clear idea of what DOC means by biodiversity. Commercial fishers will be forced to target other areas if this is closed to fishing. Fish stocks are not threatened, neither are corals & sponges. Area is not accessible so cannot be compared to Leigh.			Navy zone	Yes & letter
Limited public access to island. Harataonga coast is best place to rock fish. Commercial boats are the problem & should be banned. If it has to go ahead, please let us use areas 1, 2 & 4.	All for iwi use	Areas 1, 2 & 4.	Areas 3, 5, 7, 8 or Little Barrier Island	Yes & letter
If a reserve established, it would be fished heavily by commercial trawlers. Proposed area could not be policed. It is our customary right to collect shellfish & finfish from Arid Island, Whangapoua estuary & the coast northward.	All	Areas 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 & 8.	Areas 3 & 7 or Little Barrier Island.	Yes
If a reserve established, it would be fished heavily by commercial trawlers. Proposed area could not be policed. It is our customary right to collect shellfish & finfish from Arid Island, Whangapoua estuary & the coast northward.	All	Areas 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 & 8.	Areas 3 & 7 or Little Barrier Island.	Yes
Marine reserves fail because they increase the pressure in other areas. What about other problems such as sediment run-off and pollution? Most marine reserves end up too small, & if successful, poaching is a huge problem. Where is the evidence that marine reserves are successful? Show me evidence that they work. Will put too much pressure on other fishing areas. Save the land first.				Yes & letter & Option 4

320	24.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				Y	OC	1		1					1	Y	QS	
321	24.06.03	Riverhead	Auckland				Y		Y	OC			1	1	1					N	OO	
322	24.06.03	Beachhaven	Auckland			Y				O	1		1	1	1					N	OO	
323	24.06.03	Piha	Auckland			Y				O										N	OO	
324	30.06.03		Leigh	Leigh Fishermen's Association						Not given										N	OO	
325	26.06.03		Warkworth	Withers & Co Ltd (Managing Director)			Y		Y	OC	1									Y	QS	
326	26.06.03	Waterview	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1	1	1				Unsure	QS	
327	26.06.03	Newmarket	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO	
328	26.06.03	Private Bag Okiwi	Great Barrier Is	Orama Christian Fellowship Trust (Trustee)		Y	Y			O										Y	QS	
329	26.06.03	Mt Roskill	Auckland			Y				OC			1							N	OO	
330	26.06.03	RD 1	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				OC			1							N	OO	
331	26.06.03	Sandringham	Auckland				Y			OC				1						N	OO	
332	26.06.03		Rotorua			Y				Not given										N	OO	
333	26.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				OC			1		1	1				N	OO	
334	26.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y					O	1		1							N	OO	
335	26.06.03	Awana	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				O	1		1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
336	26.06.03		Leigh	Charter Boat Operator			Y		Y	OC			1							N	OO	
337	26.06.03	RD 3	Warkworth	Darryl Torckler's Photography			Y			O				1	1	1				1	Y	QS
338	27.06.03		Rotorua			Y				OC											N	OO
339	27.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				O											N	OO
340	27.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				Not given											N	OO

Immense sense of hope, relief and pride that steps are being taken to manage our coastal resources. Over time, marine reserve will lead to economic benefits. Would like one part of proposed area protected as a taiapure to allow customary shellfish gathering & fishing to continue as this will lead to more support for the proposal. Have lived, dived, fished commercially, tour-guided around GBI.	All	Areas 1 & 2 are suitable for a taiapure instead of a marine reserve.	Areas 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, & 8.	Yes & letter
There are alternate methods for protection e.g. limit commercial fishing, lower catch limits, increase size restrictions. Limit commercial fishing not recreational.				Yes
Fish stocks are increasing. It is my right to fish & anchor in this area. I wouldn't benefit at all from reserve.	All	All		Yes
The idea of 10% of NZ in marine reserves misses the idea that 100% of fisheries resources need to be managed. A better understanding is required & restrictions such as no fishing at spawning times.				Yes
"I oppose the proposal for the above [Great Barrier Island] marine reserve. There should be no more marine reserves until such time as an overall strategic plan for the whole of NZ is tabled to the public".				Form
Fish & bird breeding areas will be protected but DOC is unrealistic proposing a 12 mile limit from mainland. Area is remote & not in danger of depletion.	None	Area 2 & area around Rakitu Island.		Yes
Partly support idea but question why reserve has to extend so far out to sea. Marine reserves on shoreline are more accessible for the public. They also provide a good basis for environmental & scientific study. Concerned about safety of small boats in area if reserve established. Boundary should only extend to deep reefs.	None	Area 8.	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7.	Yes
Most New Zealanders cannot visit and enjoy it, those that can will be disadvantaged. Reserves should be in populated areas that have already been over fished e.g. Takapuna reef. Ban commercial fishers.	All	All	Takapuna reef.	Yes
Preserves biodiversity for posterity. Suggest limited fishing rights for locals e.g. small parts of pipi & cockle beds being occasionally available for collection. Also limited licensed fishing rights for local residents only.	Part	Areas for locals to fish.		Yes
I support the banning of all trawling in Hauraki Gulf & support Option4. A reserve that size will mean the rest of the Island gets hammered. It is a myth that recreational fishing harms fish stocks.				Yes & letter
Proposal is a blow against my human rights. Instead, ban commercial take & police existing restrictions. No benefit. Incorrect & misleading information provided by DOC.				Yes
No scientific evidence to show a marine reserve enhances biodiversity. Stop toxic run-off and excessive commercial fishers.				Yes
DOC doesn't look after the land areas they have now. How can you justify this proposal?				Yes
It is where we have always gathered shellfish.				Yes
Do not think reserve is wise use of funding available. More direct action needed prior to marine reserve e.g. legislation to reduce trawling & gillnetting, more study into effects of poisons & toxins, seasonal protection of snapper, better collaboration between Ministry of Fisheries & DOC. DOC person is needed on island to police illegal fishing.				Yes & letter
Concept is good but area too big, have some faith in residents. Should have a 6 month annual ban on harvesting of shellfish & ban trawlers. Am worried a reserve is just a start & it will affect the GBI economy e.g. devalue Okivi land. Concerned that if DOC leaves the north Barrier the school, airport etc will close & the area will die.	Part		Area 3 & 7 plus north-west area around to Miner's head.	Yes & letter
There are enough non-fishing areas e.g. cable lane. Another reserve would remove local right to fish for a feed.			Navy zone, extended out to 12 mile limit.	Yes
Underwater photographer, has used area extensively. Fish stocks will increase. Change northern boundary to ease possible policing issues. Rocks & islands north of the Needles need to be included.			Extend northern boundary so it goes around the Needles & slightly further west.	Yes
Violates my rights as a person by adding more regulations and restrictions.				Yes
None provided.				Yes
None provided.				Yes

341	27.06.03	Takapuna	Auckland	Darroch Valuations Ltd		Y						O	1		1	1	1													Not given	QO	
342	27.06.03	Awana Beach	Great Barrier Is		Y							O			1	1	1	1												N	OO	
343	27.06.03		Rotorua			Y						OC																		N	OO	
344	27.06.03	Sandringham	Auckland				Y					O			1	1		1												N	OO	
345	27.06.03	Ngongotaha	Rotorua			Y						O	1		1		1	1												N	OO	
346	27.06.03	RD 2 Silverdale	Auckland				Y					OC			1															N	OO	
347	27.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O			1	1		1												1	N	OO
348	27.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O			1	1	1	1												N	OO	
349	27.06.03	Orua Lane, RD1	Whitianga	Personal submission			Y					O			1		1	1												N	OO	
350	27.06.03		Great Barrier Is	Stellin Family (Trust Manager)	Y	Y						OC	1		1		1	1												Y	QS	
351	27.06.03	St Heliers Bay	Auckland			Y	Y					O	1		1	1	1	1	1												N	OO
352	27.06.03	RD 1 Pokeno	Auckland				Y			Y		O			1	1	1														N	QO
353	30.06.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland				Y					OC			1	1	1	1													N	OO
354	30.06.03	RD 2 Pokeno	Auckland				Y					OC			1																N	OO
355	30.06.03	Papakura	Auckland				Y					OC			1																N	OO
356	30.06.03	Pakuranga	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1	1													N	OO
357	30.06.03	Bombay Hills	Auckland				Y					Not given																			N	OO
358	30.06.03	Pukekohe	Auckland				Y					OC																			N	OO
359	30.06.03	Howick	Auckland				Y					OC			1		1														N	OO
360	30.06.03	Papatoetoe	Auckland				Y					OC			1	1	1	1													N	OO
361	30.06.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1														N	OO
362	30.06.03	Halfmoon Bay	Auckland				Y					OC			1	1	1														N	OO
363	30.06.03	Waiuku	Auckland				Y					OC			1		1														N	OO

My response is from a purely selfish view as my family & I regularly use Whangapoua estuary for gathering shellfish & coast for fishing. A reserve will restrict our activities in area, especially our right to recreationally fish. Length of GBI coast that proposal takes up is too much. Objectives of reserve can be achieved by: properly enforce existing quotas, reducing daily fish takes, limiting commercial fishing & providing for scientific conservation of the seabed.	All	Areas 1, 2, 4 & 5.	Part of areas 3 & 7 (Waikaro Point along coast to point 800m south-west of the Needles).	Letter
Too remote therefore not practical to access. Area already self governed by proximity & exposed conditions. Navy exclusion zone is a reserve. Buy Kaikoura Island & turn it into a gem like Tiritiri Matangi Island & make coast around it a reserve. This would negate the need to move DOC office to Okiwi.	All		Kaikoura Island & surrounding waters.	Yes
None provided.				Yes
No benefit to me. Navy area is already protected. NZ coastline is already protected to some degree or other by existing legislation. Marine reserves do not address major threats such as run-off or plankton blooms. Fisheries management regulations protect fish species from depletion. There is no proven benefit of reserves. Remoteness of area means it is unlikely there will be tourism or education benefits. We don't know enough about marine environment so we need more time before any decisions are made.	All	All		Yes & letter
None provided.				Yes
Location and weather protect it.	All	All		Yes
Instead of a marine reserve: prohibit fishing during spawning months, limit commercial fishing to 5 km offshore. No extra protection needed. Navy area is already protected area. Unaware that shellfish beds in estuary are depleted. Adjacent owners will lose their privacy & have to give access. Exclude commercial fishers from inside 5km of coast & prohibit fishing during spawning season instead. Marine reserves have no benefit - evidence by Floor Anthoni was negative towards marine reserves. I am unaware of any evidence that shellfish beds in estuary are at risk. As a local we constantly see pillage of sea by commercial fishers. It is a minority catch taken by recreational fishers. The stated aim of the Minister is to have 10% marine reserves & I understand he can do this with a stroke of a pen. We do not trust DOC.	All	All		Yes & Option 4
Prohibit fishing during spawning months, limit commercial fishing within 5 km radius of GBI. Weather prohibits fishing in area. Dr Anthoni's comments seem applicable. Stop pollution. If a reserve went ahead, who would go there?	All	All		Yes
Proposed area practically prohibits any gathering & spear fishing from Harataonga to the Needles. This is good sheltered water used by the above methods. As a diver I would like to see the larger packhorse crayfish protected, a reserve the size indicated is unnecessary.				Yes
Taiapure within reserve that covers estuary & near shore coastal areas. Area too big so go back to original proposal.	All	Coastal areas 1, 2, 3, & 4.	Area proposed by Steering Group in 1990s.	Yes
Our family wishes to continue our activities unhindered. I can't see any benefits above what we enjoy now.				Yes
When wind is from west this area is only place to get shelter & to fish. Sheltered anchorages should not be in reserve. Prefer reserve not to be in sheltered areas so have it in deep waters instead.		Sheltered anchorages marked on map in areas 3 & 4.	Area 6 & 8.	Yes
Hard to get to are & no benefit.	All			Yes
No benefit.	All			Yes
Doesn't solve the problem, keep commercial fishers out.	All			Yes
None provided.				Yes
No benefit.				Yes
No benefit.				Yes
Not enough areas to recreationally fish as it is.				Yes
Due to its location from Auckland, the area will never be over fished by recreational fishers.				Yes
Area is large & inaccessible to most people & is a productive fishery. Why not make a marine reserve in an accessible area like Goat Island or where snapper spawn?		Areas 3 & 5 as productive fishing areas.	In an accessible area such as Goat Island or where snapper spawn.	Yes
None provided.		Area 5		Yes
Most productive area on Barrier and I would no longer have any reason to visit.				Yes

364	30.06.03	Birkenhead	Auckland				Y												O				1			1												N	OO						
365	30.06.03	Pakuranga	Auckland	Wildboy NZ (Director)	Y			Y											O				1			1		1											N	OO					
366	30.06.03	Howick	Auckland					Y											OC				1			1													N	QO					
367	30.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													OC				1	1															N	OO					
368	30.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													O	1			1	1		1	1	1	1	1										N	OO				
369	30.06.03	Highland Park	Auckland				Y												OC				1	1		1	1													N	OO				
370	30.06.03	Hillcrest	North Shore				Y												O				1	1		1	1	1												N	OO				
371	30.06.03	Hillcrest	North Shore				Y												OC				1	1		1	1													N	OO				
372	30.06.03	Pakuranga	Auckland				Y												O				1			1															N	OO			
373	30.06.03	Henderson	Auckland					Y											OC					1																	N	OO			
374	30.06.03	Henderson	Auckland					Y											OC					1																	N	OO			
375	30.06.03	Henderson	Auckland					Y											OC				1	1																	N	OO			
376	30.06.03	Henderson	Auckland				Y												OC				1	1		1	1														N	OO			
377	30.06.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y														O				1	1		1	1														Y	S			
378	30.06.03		Great Barrier Is	Great Barrier Marine Radio (Owner/Operator)	Y	Y													O	1																					N	QO			
379	30.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													OC	1			1			1															N	OO			
380	30.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													OC					1	1		1															N	OO		
381	30.06.03	Mt Eden	Auckland					Y											OC				1	1		1	1														N	OO			
382	30.06.03	Epsom	Auckland				Y												O				1																			N	OO		
383	30.06.03	Epsom	Auckland				Y												O				1																			N	OO		
384	30.06.03	Silverdale	Auckland				Y												O				1																			N	OO		
385	30.06.03	Te Atatu	Auckland			Y	Y												O	1			1	1		1	1															Y	OO		
386	30.06.03	Mangere Bridge	Auckland			Y	Y												O				1	1		1																N	OO		
387	30.06.03	Whenuapai	Auckland				Y												OC				1	1		1																N	OO		
388	30.06.03	Miranda	Thames				Y												OC				1																			1	N	OO	
389	30.06.03	Glen Eden	Auckland			Y	Y												O				1	1		1	1															N	OO		
390	30.06.03	New Lynn	Auckland				Y												O				1	1																		N	OO		
391	30.06.03	South Auckland	Auckland		Y	Y																	1	1																			1	N	OO

Will limit recreational fishing rights considering other areas of Hauraki Gulf are being put forward as marine reserves. It will negatively affect charter & recreational boats as well as boating economy. Fishing competitions will suffer.				Yes
Leisure fishing, diving & spear fishing do not equate to the real problem of too many cray pots & close inshore long-lining. Safety concerns as people will have to take their small craft out further. Problem lies with commercial long-lining & trawling. Leisure craft should be able to fish out to 5 miles off shore & commercial should be restricted to 12 miles out to allow fish to breed.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.		Yes
No consideration of majority of fishers visiting this area. Proposal serves a minority who will never visit area. Formation of smaller reserves in particular areas could be considered only with agreement of interested parties.				Yes
DOC not capable of overseeing such a reserve.		All		Yes
DOC is not the one to oversee a reserve in this area.		All		Yes
Cut quotas (commercial & recreational) if fisheries are in danger.	All	All		Yes
Location means it won't be over fished. People will lose interest & not visit island which will therefore take away business of residents.	All	All		Yes
Hard to get to, no benefit.	All			Yes
Due to location the area is not being overused. No benefit at all.		All		Yes
Police existing laws.				Yes
Too much pressure will be placed on areas outside reserves.				Yes
Plenty of fish & nature is doing its own job. Ministry of Fisheries is doing good job with quota management & DOC should keep out of it.				Yes
Cut commercial quotas. A reserve here will put more pressure on other areas. Money would be better spent by Ministry of Fisheries on education & enforcement.		All		Yes
More marine life & coast will be more like it was before heavy commercial fishing. Every place a reserve has been tried it has been a success. A reserve will be a major improvement for everyone who enjoys the coast.				Yes
Operated marine radio for 42 years & resident on island for 80 years & owned Arid Island for 6 years for farming. Area is too big but I would support a small area around Arid Island only. A reserve would be a great disadvantage for fishermen & boaties.			Area 5, limited area around Arid Island.	Yes
Reserve should be on mainland NZ for the benefit of everyone. Access is difficult & area is too expensive to visit. Shellfish harvesting should be allowed in estuary.	Part			Yes
DOC not operating in the best interests of taxpayers.				Yes
Would limit or curtail my current activities in area.				Yes
Who could police the reserve? Those that comply will lose out to those that flout the law. Many of the species in your glossy brochure will be unaffected whether it's a reserve or not. Navy zone is already a reserve. Proposed reserve takes up nearly all the good anchoring spots on eastern side of GBI. Not happy with GBI brochure or questions on questionnaire. Cutting commercial quotas of some depleted species would be more beneficial. Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.	All	All		Yes & Letter & Form letter
It is our right to be able to feed ourselves. Waste of taxpayer money.	All	All		Yes
Location & weather protect area.	All	All		Yes
No marine reserve. It is hard fishing. DOC doesn't know what they are doing.		All		Yes
I will be disadvantaged. I fish in winter off Arid Island & will go bust.	All	All		Yes
No need or benefit in the proposed reserve. Effect will be totally negative on my relaxation & recreational activities. The fishery is extremely good. Existing regulations & controls work fine. A reserve will tie up a lot of sea for no reason.	All	All		Yes
I only visit area occasionally but fish for food. I don't need a reserve & it will not benefit me.	All	All		Yes
I fish all year round & if a reserve is made I would not visit GBI anymore & will be disadvantaged.	All	All		Yes
I use area for recreational diving and fishing. No reserve anywhere on GBI.	All	All		Yes
I oppose, no benefit.				Yes

392	30.06.03		Otorohanga				Y							O			1						1	N	OO	
393	30.06.03		Otorohanga				Y							O			1						1	N	OO	
394	30.06.03	Te Atatu	Auckland				Y							O		1	1	1	1					N	OO	
395	30.06.03	Ranui	Auckland			Y		Y						N		1	1							N	OO	
396	30.06.03	Te Atatu	Auckland				Y							O		1	1							1	N	OO
397	30.06.03	Not given	Not given			Y	Y							O				1	1					1	N	OO
398	30.06.03	Manukau	Auckland			Y	Y							O		1	1							1	N	OO
399	30.06.03	Not given	Not given			Y	Y							O		1	1	1	1					1	N	OO
400	Undated	Swanson	Auckland			Y	Y							O		1	1	1							N	OO
401	Undated	Hillsborough	Auckland			Y	Y							O		1					1			1	N	OO
402	Undated	Massey	Auckland			Y	Y							O		1					1				N	OO
403	Undated	Glen Eden	Auckland			Y	Y							O		1	1	1						1	N	OO
404	Undated		Te Kuiti				Y							O		1								1	N	OO
405	Undated	Te Atatu North	Auckland			Y	Y							O		1	1							1	N	OO
406	Undated	Mt Eden	Auckland				Y							O		1	1	1	1						N	OO
407	Undated	Henderson	Auckland				Y							O	1		1	1	1	1					N	OO
408	Undated	Henderson	Auckland					Y						OC		1									N	OO
409	Undated	Mangere Bridge	Auckland			Y		Y						OC		1								1	N	OO
410	Undated	Swanson	Auckland	Bethells Casters & Anglers Club (President)		Y		Y		Y				OC	1		1	1	1					1	N	OO
411	Undated	Pakuranga	Auckland				Y							OC		1	1	1	1						N	OO
412	Undated	Massey	Auckland			Y	Y							O		1	1	1						1	N	OO
413	Undated	Massey	Auckland			Y	Y							O		1	1	1						1	N	OO
414	Undated	West Harbour	Auckland			Y	Y							O		1	1	1						1	N	OO
415	Undated		Otorohanga			Y	Y							O		1	1	1						1	N	OO
416	Undated	Mt Albert	Auckland				Y							O		1								1	N	OO
417	Undated	Drury	Auckland			Y	Y							O		1	1							1	N	OO
418	Undated	Glen Eden	Auckland			Y	Y							O		1	1							1	N	OO

Fish for food. Fish in winter only. I oppose.	All	All		Yes
Fish for food. Fish in winter only. I oppose.	All	All		Yes
Good fishing & diving & provides safe activities due to wind directions for most of year. Uses areas 2, 3, 4 & 5 for fishing, diving & boating.		Areas 2, 3, 4 & 5.		Yes
DOC staff are untrustworthy, bend truth, need re-training on how to operate their department. No benefit in reserve.	All	All		Yes
Fish for food so reserve is unwanted.	All	All		Yes
Unwanted, no benefit & will be a disadvantage. Only visit GBI in winter & spend money with the locals.	All	All		Yes
Fish in winter here & spend hundreds of dollars. No benefit.	All	All		Yes
Only fish in winter here & spend lots of dollars over there. No benefit.	All	All		Yes
I am unable to understand why DOC see that recreational impacts on this area are significant enough to plan such a move. Land-based users need to have areas to fish for food. Keep the economy of 900-1000 permanent residents employed. Fragile community relies on clubs & public to fill motels, restaurants etc. Will DOC pay an unemployment benefit to those who lose their jobs as result of reserve? Leave areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7 alone for land-based users.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.		Yes
I fish (land-based fishing) for food in winter to feed my extended family & oppose a marine reserve in this area. I will be disadvantaged by a reserve & there will be no benefit. I spent \$2000 on GBI last winter when I was fishing over there & if a reserve is established I will not visit & there will be an economic loss to the community. DOC has not done economic & social impact assessment of proposed reserve, including impact on ferries who go to island etc. Believes many people camping at Harataonga camp there to fish. DOC doesn't understand fishing patterns on island. Auckland public have been unable to get copies of brochure & questionnaire & DOC has not met with clubs who have requested meetings. Are DOC aware that everything they administer belongs to the NZ public, who also pay their salaries?	All	All		Yes & letter
Our family enjoys fishing there. Visit in winter & spend a bit of cash. No benefit.	All	All		Yes
Too many marine reserves already. Not benefit.	All	All		Yes
I oppose. I fish in winter only. No benefit.	All	All		Yes
No benefit to me, I oppose	All	All		Yes
This is a fantastic fishing spot and great piece of countryside. Arid Island should be excluded. Stop commercial only. Look at better management of commercial fishing & leave recreational alone.		Area 5		Yes
Is this a Maori reserve or a Pakeha reserve?				Yes
Stop commercial fishing.				Yes
Fish for food. No benefit. I oppose any reserve on GBI.	All	All		Yes
Club has 70 members. As a club we visit this area & land-base fish once or twice per year. Individual members visit more often. East side of island is sheltered from prevailing winds. DOC is only a caretaker of area so we all have a stake in Northern Barrier land. We see land-based users having very small impact on area & small number of boats use area due to distance from mainland. A reserve will affect an already fragile economy on GBI. If commercial fishers target this area, then target them. Police existing rules & look after reserves already in place. Recreational fishers are being pushed into smaller and smaller areas but the demand is the same demand. Have you thought about what will happen to the areas left?		Areas 2, 3, 4 & 5	Area 6	Yes
Not easily accessible, no benefit.				Yes
I oppose, no benefit, fish in winter only.	All	All		Yes
I oppose, no benefit, fish in winter only.	All	All		Yes
I oppose, no benefit, fish in winter only.	All	All		Yes
I oppose, no benefit, fish in winter only.	All	All		Yes
Top spot, too large an area to take out. I don't think I can benefit & I can snorkel anywhere e.g. Goat Island. This is an area I use every time I go. What is wrong with marine areas not used so much e.g. Cuvier Island?			Cuvier Island.	Yes
I oppose, no benefit but disadvantage.	All	All		Yes
I oppose, I will be disadvantaged, I fish in winter only & won't go back if made into a reserve.	All	All		Yes

419	Undated	Mt Eden	Auckland			Y				O			1	1					1	N	OO
420	Undated	Kelston	Auckland		Y	Y	Y			O			1	1					1	N	OO
421	Undated	Glen Eden	Auckland				Y			OC					1					N	QS
422	Undated	Greenlane	Auckland			Y	Y			O			1	1		1			1	N	OO
423	Undated	Manurewa	Auckland				Y			O			1	1						N	OO
424	Undated	Te Atatu	Auckland				Y			OC			1							N	OO
425	Undated	Glen Eden	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1		1				N	OO
426	Undated	Glendowie	Auckland				Y			O			1	1						N	OO
427	Undated	Western Springs	Auckland				Y			O			1	1						N	OO
428	Undated	Glen Eden	Auckland				Y			O			1	1		1	1			N	OO
429	Undated	Piha	Auckland			Y		Y		OC			1							N	OO
430	Undated	Mt Roskill	Auckland			Y	Y			O			1	1		1			1	N	OO
431	Undated	Massey	Auckland			Y	Y			O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
432	Undated	Onehunga	Auckland	West Fishing Club				Y		OC									1	N	OO
433	Undated	Maraetai	Auckland				Y			O			1	1						N	OO
434	Undated		Otorohanga			Y	Y			O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
435	Undated	Massey	Auckland			Y	Y			O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
436	Undated	Point Chevalier	Auckland				Y			O			1	1					1	N	OO
437	Undated	Titirangi Beach	Auckland				Y			O			1		1	1				N	OO
438	Undated	Massey	Auckland			Y	Y			O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
439	Undated	Glen Eden	Auckland					Y		Not given			1							N	OO
440	Undated	Pakuranga	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
441	Undated	Massey	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1	1				1	N	OO
442	Undated	Massey	Auckland					Y		OC				1		1				N	OO
443	Undated	Te Atatu	Auckland			Y	Y			O			1	1					1	N	OO
444	Undated	Pakuranga	Auckland					Y		OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
445	Undated	Greenhithe	Auckland					Y		OC			1	1		1				N	OO
446	Undated	New Lynn	Auckland				Y			O			1	1						N	OO
447	Undated	Henderson	Auckland				Y			O			1		1				1	N	OO
448	Undated	Glen Eden	Auckland			Y	Y			O			1	1		1			1	N	OO
449	Undated	Bucklands Beach	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1		1			1	N	OO
450	Undated	Otara	Auckland				Y			OC	1					1			1	N	OO
451	Undated	Glen Eden	Auckland 1007							N			1	1						N	OO
452	Undated	Glenfield	Auckland	Wanderers Fishing Club (member)			Y	Y		O			1			1				N	OO
453	Undated	Titirangi	Auckland			Y		Y		OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO

I don't like the idea. I will be disadvantaged. I won't be able to take my kids there and show them how to fish.	All	All		Yes
My family own land at Katherine Bay. That means no fishing around that area so I don't want a reserve on GBI.	All	All		Yes
Different bird species not normally found in other places.	None			Yes
I oppose, I will be disadvantaged, I fish in winter only & won't go back if made into a reserve.	All	All		Yes
I use this area for recreational fishing & diving. No benefit.	All	All		Yes
Eastern side exposed & offers very little shelter. A minimal amount of fishing & diving by recreational fishers is carried out which in turn has protected the area. DOC should concentrate on impact of commercial fishing on environment as this is more than what recreational fishing is doing.	All	All		Yes
We need recreational fishing.	All	All		Yes
I use this area for recreational fishing and diving. No benefit. No reserve anywhere on GBI.	All	All		Yes
I use this area for recreational fishing and diving. No benefit. No reserve anywhere on GBI.	All	All		Yes
I reject the idea. I love fishing for food & enjoyment. There will be no benefit to the locals - it will be a big disadvantage to them. I only fish there in winter & I fish the east side & spend money on accommodation & food & at the pub.	All	All		Yes
I fish and dive this area. No reserve on GBI.	All	All		Yes
Fish for food & fish in winter and won't return if a reserve is there. I will be disadvantaged.	All	All		Yes
Fish for food, I fish winter only. No benefit.	All	All		Yes
Use area for sport fishing & food. No benefit. Can't see point of reserve as this area is not over fished.		All		Yes
Very much appreciate this area for recreational fishing and diving. No benefit, no reserve on GBI.	All	All		Yes
Fish for food, I fish winter only. No benefit.	All	All		Yes
Fish for food, I fish winter only. No benefit.	All	All		Yes
No benefit.				Yes
Hit on the commercial sector, not the recreational fisher. Reserve may mean better fishing. Leave estuary to locals. Coastline is small part of fishery, what about out wide?	All			Yes
Fish for food, I fish winter only. No benefit.	All	All		Yes
I oppose, no benefit.	All	All		Yes
No benefit.	All	All		Yes
Not necessary. No benefit. Fish in winter only. More public consultation.	All	All		Yes
No benefit & need more public consultation.	All	All		Yes
Fish to feed family. No benefit.	All	All		Yes
Would not benefit us at all.				Yes
Not necessary. No benefit. More public consultation required & more reasons given to the public about the need for a reserve.	All	All		Yes
I use this area for recreational fishing and diving. No benefit. No reserve anywhere on GBI.	All	All		Yes
Nothing in the area needs protection. I don't believe that recreational fishing & diving has any adverse effect in this area.	All	All		Yes
Visit and fish in winter time, feed family. Spend amount of dollars (\$500). No benefit.	All	All		Yes
No benefit, disadvantage for locals. Visit and fish in winter time and spend when I am there. About \$400 per weekend. Will not go there if there is a reserve.	All	All		Yes
No benefit, disadvantage for locals. Only go there in the winter & spend quite a bit of time & money over there.	All	All		Yes
Restricts fishing.	All	All		Yes
GBI is an isolated island which people visit for recreational & boating activities which in turn supports local businesses. No benefit as this area is where I visit on my trips to GBI & if this was taken away I would stop going which would mean no benefit to local businesses. All DOC is doing is hurting local businesses.	All	All		Yes
My family will go hungry.	All	All		Yes

454	Undated	Glen Eden	Auckland				Y			OC		1		1	1				N	OO
455	Undated	Henderson	Auckland			Y	Y			O		1	1	1	1				N	OO
456	Undated	Titirangi	Auckland				Y			OC		1	1		1				N	OO
457	Undated	One Tree Hill	Auckland				Y			OC		1	1						N	OO
458	Undated		Otorohanga				Y			O		1	1	1				1	N	OO
459	Undated		Otorohanga				Y			O		1						1	N	OO
460	Undated	Te Atatu South	Auckland				Y			O	1				1		1		N	OO
461	Undated	Blockhouse Bay	Auckland			Y	Y			O		1	1	1				1	N	OO
462	Undated	Tuakau	Auckland					Y		OC		1	1		1				N	OO
463	30.06.03	Balmain, Sydney, NSW 2041	Australia			Y	Y			O	1	1	1		1			1	Y	QS
464	30.06.03	Takapuna	Auckland			Y	Y			O	1	1		1	1			1	Y/N	QS
465	Undated	Te Atatu Peninsula	Auckland				Y			O		1	1	1	1	1			N	OO
466	30.06.03	Maunu	Whangarei				Y			OC		1	1	1					Y	S
467	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y			OC		1		1	1				N	OO
468	Undated	Manukau	Auckland				Y			O	1	1	1	1					N	OO
469	Undated		Orewa 1461					Y		OC									Y	QS
470	Undated	Mt Eden	Auckland					Y		OC		1	1		1				N	OO
471	Undated	Northcote	Auckland				Y			O		1		1					Y	S
472	Undated	Bucklands Beach	Auckland				Y			O		1	1	1	1				N	OO

No benefit as I will not be able to do the activities I normally do. I visit in summer and winter to fish & carry out other recreational activities & spend a considerable amount of money.	All	All		Yes
More than enough marine reserves already. Would not benefit me in any way. Community relies on financial support of fishermen. This will cause a decline in tourist numbers & will effect community employment.	All			Yes
It will affect everyone over here and there. No benefit & a big disadvantage to locals & community. I go there winter and summer to fish and support locals by spending money over there. I will not visit if a reserve is established.	All	All		Yes
I recreationally fish in the area. No benefit anywhere on GBI. Area is not over fished.	All	All		Yes
I fish for food, fish in winter only.	All	All		Yes
I fish for food, fish in winter only.	All	All		Yes
It is our customary right to use this area. We will not benefit, nor will the public.	All	All		Yes
There is no benefit, but disadvantage. I just visit GBI in winter, spend at least \$450 each visit & will go elsewhere if it becomes a reserve.	All	All		Yes
I use this place for recreational fishing. I do not think the area is over fished. No reserve anywhere on GBI.	All	All		Yes
Have visited north-east coast of GBI since 1977 & undertake rock-fishing, land-based visits to area between the Needles & Harotaonga. A well conceived management plan for area could result in increased tourism & rising land values. Reserve will replenish fish but if it is completely no-take we will not be able to fish there. Area will be extremely difficult to police. Attention needs to be paid to access to the reserve, especially for safe boat launching. The manner in which DOC is going about establishing the reserve is all wrong - small numbers of Barrier residents use this area but many residents object simply because of the approach being taken to create it. Concern about commercial trawling damaging area. Concern about impact on birds if visitor numbers increase after reserve is established. DOC needs to develop a management approach which integrates land & marine conservation & coordinate this with Auckland City & have community engagement.	Part for locals	Waikaro Point & areas to north & south.		Yes & letter
Have visited GBI for past 53 years. Support a marine reserve somewhere but not one of proposed size. Consideration needs to be given to local customary use, for example, we have no boat so cannot fish on other side of island & rock fishing and paua gathering is an important way of Barrier life. Benefits of reserve would include increased fish stocks but this would be of no benefit to us if we were unable to catch some. We gather shellfish from estuary & consider it important for local people to be able to do so. Area would be difficult to police. Increased tourism unlikely due to remoteness and access difficulties, as is increase in land values. Ban commercial fishing in meantime.	Part	Waikaro Point & surrounding area.		Yes
Want to be able to dive and fish all around the Barrier. Little benefit so leave it as it is.	All	All		Yes
Improved fish stocks & improved diving. Fully support aiming for 10% of coastline, benefits will outweigh drawbacks. Marine reserves have proven their value around the country. I have dived at Poor Knights, Leigh, Gisborne & Kermadec Islands & have enjoyed them all.	None			Yes
Area is little used now so keep it open. Leave inshore areas alone & look at commercial fishery.	All	All		Yes
I won't benefit.				Yes
Protection of diverse marine ecosystems and endangered species for future generations. Tangata whenua could have limited shellfish gathering in estuary provided it could be controlled.	Part for iwi			Yes
Disgusted with the thought that you would restrict fishing in this manner. Have enjoyed some superb days in this region & I want to continue. No one will benefit except commercial fishing interests. Who will patrol the area? Concentrate on commercial fishing instead.	All	All		Yes
Having seen Goat Island work I see the sense in small, specific no-take areas. The isolation of area surely means it is naturally protected & means that sensible commercial and amateur management is all that's required? However, I support the specific area of total reserve.		None		Yes
I agree in principle but not in this location. Could be better placed to have less impact on recreational use & better for fish restocking - suggest Little Barrier Island.		Areas 2, 4 & 5.	Little Barrier Island.	Yes

473	Undated	RD 1 Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														OC				1	1		1								N	OO	
474	Undated	Buckland's Beach	Auckland 1730				Y													OC				1	1	1	1			1					N	S	
475	Undated	Pakuranga	Auckland	Race Management Royal NZ Yacht Squadron (Principle Race Officer)			Y			Y										O				1	1										Y	S	
476	Undated	Greenhithe	Auckland				Y			Y										O				1	1	1	1									N	QO
477	Undated		Warkworth				Y													O				1		1									Y	QS	
478	Undated	Halfmoon Bay	Auckland				Y													OC							1								Y	QS	
479	Undated	Mt Albert	Auckland			Y														O				1	1		1								Y/N	QS	
480	Undated	Mt Albert	Auckland			Y														O				1			1								Y	QS	
481	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														O	1			1	1	1	1								1	N	OO
482	Undated	Halfmoon Bay	Auckland				Y													OC				1	1		1									N	OO
483	Undated	Greenhithe	Auckland				Y													OC				1		1										N	OO
484	Undated	Tuapiro Rd	Katikati				Y													O				1	1	1	1								1	N	OO
485	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y													O				1		1										N	OO
486	Undated		Taupo				Y													O				1	1		1									N	OO
487	Undated		Whangamata	Whangamata Ocean Sports Club (Manager)			Y													O				1	1	1									1	N	OO

DOC can't be trusted to be honest & it will change to suit DOC in later years. The way this has been laid out with untruths & half-truths bears out our experiences with DOC.	All			Yes
Increased bird and fish life that would eventually spread to other areas.				Yes
Race management is an integral part of the RNZYS & most other members would support the reserve concept but have not been canvassed. Benefits to us would include: clear & unobstructed waters, pristine environment with no fishing boats & mussel farms. Fits with our idea for a Hauraki Gulf Marine Park - a yachtsman's paradise with unobstructed navigation.	None	None		Yes
Own a charter boat & have family holidays in area. Am a keen diver/snorkel-er with a passion towards the sea & like the theory of marine reserves & protected places. However, disapprove of DOC's GBI proposal. Area is naturally protected. We go there once a month with the intension of going around Rakitu Island but can only get there 20% of the times we try. We enjoy the right to fish when conditions allow. I may be able to support a limited area of marine reserve in parts of this coast but not the big chunks which you are trying to claim.		Areas marked on map which include parts of areas 3, 4 & 5.		Yes & letter
Support the principle but proposal is excessively large, why 12 miles out to sea? You must know that would raise the ire of the recreational & commercial fishers. Recreational people can hardly get out there as it is due to weather. Reserve would encourage the proliferation of species.	All	Arid Island		Yes
Will preserve inshore reef species which will preserve recreational diving & snorkeling value of this coast in an international context. Part of estuary should be excluded. Part of proposal should be no-take & the rest limited take, hand line fishing only & reduced quota.	Part	Areas 5, 6, 7 & 8 should be a limited take zone.	Areas 1, 2, 3 & 4.	Yes
Family have lived in this area since late 1800s. Support idea but not proposed area. Support smaller area. Stop commercial fishing in area and exclude some parts for recreational fishers.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3 & 4 should be recreational fishing only.	Areas 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
Supports in principle but not in proposed area. Entire estuary should be excluded because it is an access-way to open sea. Areas for recreational fishing should also be excluded & areas adjacent to DOC camping grounds. Keep commercial fishing out of area and exclude some parts for recreational fishers. It is trawlers who have stripped this area of marine life in past 20 years, not recreational fishers.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3 & 4 should be for recreational fishing only.	Areas 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
Totally oppose proposal as it ignores the real reasons of marine environmental degradation e.g. excessive commercial trawling & netting, siltation & pollution, algal blooms, tube worm. DOC should communication more with local residents like us, who have lived here for generations. There are better ways of protecting our marine life including: ban all bulk fishing methods in Hauraki Gulf, control pollution from mainland, more studies on algal bloom cause and prevention, stricter control on tube worm, closed fishing period at spawning time (Oct/Nov). If our coastal waters were managed this way 100% of our coast would be protected rather than DOC's target of 10%. Rock fishing & recreational boat fishing have had no impact on fish numbers. Exposed nature of coast controls the number of small boats & Ministry of Fisheries also limit catches. It will be a sad day when families cannot pick pipis & fish from rocks for lunch - this has been our way of life for 90 years & we have always taken great care to protect coastline.	All	All		Yes & letter
It is not required. Current laws give adequate protection. DOC does not represent all users of the outdoors equally i.e. it is biased. Area is an important recreational area for the people of Auckland, not to be locked up by eco-fundamentalists.	All			Yes
NZ has too many marine reserves at present. I see no benefit.	All	All		Yes
Not necessary or required. Far too large. Unable & uneconomic to control area & would be an infringement of personal rights. No benefit. Another example of government interference on personal rights without proper consultation.	All	All		Yes
Area is already protected by its geographic location and conditions. Reserve would preclude me from doing that activities that attract me to the area. The reasoning behind the proposal is flawed & fail to see how reserve would benefit the public apart from a few financially interested parties.	All	All		Yes
Recreational fishing in this area is still important.				Yes
We require the rights of New Zealanders to fish where we like and not to be told where to go.	All			Yes & Option 4

488	Undated		Warkworth					Y				OC			1	1	1	1												N	OO
489	Undated		Thames	Forest & Bird Thames Hauraki Branch (Secretary)				Y				OC				1		1												Y	S
490	Undated	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O			1	1		1											Y	QS	
491	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1	1											N	OO	
492	Undated	Northcote	Auckland					Y				OC			1	1														N	OO
493	Undated	Freemans Bay	Auckland			Y						OC			1		1										1		N	OO	
494	Undated	Bethells Beach	Auckland			Y	Y					O		1	1	1	1	1												N	OO
495	Undated	Takapuna	Auckland		Y							OC						1											Y	QS	
496	Undated	Howick	Auckland					Y				OC					1												Y	S	
497	Undated	Oneroa	Waiheke Island	NZ Kiwi Foundation, Forest & Bird, Waitakere Ranges Protection Society (volunteer, educator)				Y				OC			1			1											Y	S	
498	Undated	Newton	Auckland				Y			Y		OC						1											Y	S	
499	Undated	Bucklands Beach	Auckland					Y				OC			1	1		1									1			N	OO
500	Undated	Manukau City	Auckland	Hine Vincent Whanau Trust (Ngati Rehua, Ngati Wai ki Aotea)		Y	Y			Y		OC	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			N	OO
501	Undated	Howick	Auckland									O						1												N	OO

No scientific evidence that reserve is needed. I want to see a strategic plan of proposed reserves in place first.				Yes
Long term benefits include preservation for perpetuity of a unique marine area, opportunity for renewal & protection of the biodiversity & unique character of area. Reserve will form part of a ring of protected areas, further strengthening opportunities for study, increasing fish stocks. It seems so little to ask for the protection of this area when marine fishers & divers have access to many other areas.	None	None		Yes
Benefits include a place to dive, purely to see & enjoy the sea life. Fishing would no doubt improve near proposed reserve but could you compete with cray pots. Proposal is far too greedy. Ban nets everywhere on Barrier, stop all commercial fishing, no snapper fishing when they are spawning. There should be a series of small reserves around Barrier where it is over fished. I only support reserve I have marked on map.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 & 8.	Rakitu Island & area 4.	Yes
There is no threat to fish stocks so why lock up vast area when fish numbers have been reported to be increasing? No benefit to my family & friends who will be excluded from fishing in area.		Area 3.		Yes
Habitats are in excellent shape & do not require protection. No benefit to me from being excluded from fishing in this area. Existing fisheries regulations can protect area. Logistics protect the area sufficiently. Proposal size staggering & public meetings on GBI show almost no local support.	All			Yes
Not enough research into size of reserves - no real scientific basis to show any benefit of a bigger reserve. I agree with principle of reserves but have serious concerns on location of this one as it is too remote to allow anyone other than a select few to visit area. Barrier lacks infrastructure for eco-tourism. Ban commercial fishing instead.				Yes
Area self governing due to weather and sea. No benefit & reserves actually depopulate themselves due to larger fish taking over. DOC is simply creating a cash cow for itself to gather more funding. You do not have the consensus of people on the island. Don't bend the truth for your own means.	All	All		Yes
Support the proposal with reservations. More than other areas of NZ, parts of GBI are used for food collection which is sustenance, not recreational fishing. Benefits include enjoying continued diversity of marine life. Estuary should remain accessible for food gathering. Cut 12 miles to 8. Agree in principle but insist on consideration of those depending on area for sustenance.	All	Area from 8-12 nautical miles.		Yes
More fish & marine life to see when diving. I hope it helps other areas staying stocked with fish & crayfish that I can take. The Barrier's getting fished out & I am very glad someone (DOC) is doing something about it. The bigger the reserve, the better.				Yes
Satisfaction of knowing all visitors to area will have chance to respect its special qualities in perpetuity. Awana & Navy area should also be considered for the reserve.	None	None	Include Awana Beach & Navy area as well.	Yes
Grew up on GBI & parents still live there. A reserve will benefit future children and grandchildren. Marine reserves provide breeding protection areas, marine life flows out to other areas. It is totally necessary.				Yes
Visit proposed are in a boat for one week every summer & are concerned that safe shelter will be in reserve. This is a remote area with low visitation numbers. Support restricted fishing but not totally no-take. Would support reserve if it allowed hand-line recreational fishing as we have no refrigeration and catch and prepare fish for meals. Maybe look at south-east GBI instead as there are no safe anchorages there.		Parts of areas 2, 3, 4 & 5.	Navy zone or south-east GBI.	Yes
Many areas within proposed area have been used by our iwi. Area also holds ancestry & history. Whangapoua Beach is a very important place as it is part of our Whakapapa. If are is a marine reserve it will take a large part away from our iwi which is very much a part of us. We gather kaimoana of all sorts from within whole proposal area & have done for many generations. Our whakapapa has strong links to Rakitu Island, hapuka grounds. This area has been a part of our way of life and survival for our iwi at times when things were hard. We use the area for surf-casting, rock & boat fishing & collect paua, kina, scallops, patiki, mullet, tuna, marlin, pipi, cockles, hapuka. What about our customary rights and the Treaty of Waitangi? I would hope that we could still continue customary use of area.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.		Yes & letter
Area not over fished. No fishing already in Navy area.		Coastal areas 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.		Yes

502	Undated	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y						O						1	1					N	OO	
503	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1							N	OO
504	Undated	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is	Aotea Kayak Adventures (Head Guide), PhD Marine microbiology	Y						O	1		1		1	1	1			1		Y	QS	
505	Undated	RD 2	Whitianga				Y				OC					1							Y	QS	
506	Undated	Forest Lake	Hamilton				Y				O			1		1	1							N	OO
507	Undated	Halfmoon Bay	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1							Y	QS
508	Undated		Auckland				Y				O			1		1	1							N	QO
509	Undated	Onehunga	Auckland				Y				OC			1			1							Y	S
510	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y		Y		O			1	1						1			Y	QS
511	Undated	Torbay	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1		1							Y	QS
512	Undated	RD 2	Whitianga				Y		Y		OC													Y	S
513	Undated		Rotorua				Y				OC			1	1	1	1	1						Y	S
514	Undated	Torbay	Auckland				Y				OC			1		1								N	OO
515	Undated		Hamilton				Y				OC			1		1	1							N	OO
516	Undated	Baylys Beach	Dargaville				Y		Y		OC	1		1			1							N	OO
517	Undated	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y						O	1				1								Y	QS
518	Undated	St Heliers	Auckland								O			1	1	1	1							N	OO
519	Undated	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC						1	1						Y	QS

Do not support proposal because a yes would be positive & we don't need reserve, we need fishing regulations. I will not benefit & will no longer be able to get fresh flounder to eat. Am very disappointed with all the misleading information contained in DOC publicity about proposal e.g. decade of discussions. In addition, support was minimal at meetings on island yet DOC keeps claiming local support.	All	All		Yes
There are many other places, less used & less accessible, that would be suitable for a marine reserve. This area is a prime fishing & diving wilderness which is relatively unspoiled. I suggest a reserve from the Needles to the Mokohinau Islands. Leave the back of Barrier alone.	All	All	From the Needles to the Mokohinau Islands (exclude actual islands) out to 12 nautical mile limit.	Yes
Benefits are: preservation for future, business benefits, packhorse cray protection, enhanced biodiversity & future enjoyment/education. Cultural & local collection of marine species is important. Concerned about policing as it can only be controlled from water so suggest involving Navy. Also need toilets and camping grounds at designated areas e.g. Rangiwahakaea Bay.	Part	Area 4 but include a protected packhorse crayfish zone.	Areas 3, 5, 6 & 7, part of area 4 & move southern boundary to meet Navy zone.	Yes
Support idea in principle & have been involved with reserves in past but am now seeing another point of view. With such a large reserve, as this proposal is, consideration must be given to residents who live between the boundaries of proposed reserve. Living on an island is a lot different to the mainland. I suggest giving official licenses to residents along reserve boundaries to catch a limit reflecting food needs - restrict to hand line only & 2 cray pots per resident. Residents would then feel favourably towards proposal.	Part for locals	Locals should have access for food.		Yes & letter
Area would be better with catch restrictions rather than a total ban e.g. reduce recreational bag limits & increase minimum size for entire Barrier.	All			Yes
In the years from now we can dive in an area that is spectacular. A reserve will improve fishing around area. Reserve should be smaller.	All	Area 8 & area south of Whakatautuna Point.		Yes
Currently there are ample no-fishing zones e.g. Navy zone. Most of safe anchorages on back of Barrier are included in this reserve which will increase the risk of traveling outside reserve to fish and dive. Consider areas which are not fished or dived due to exposed conditions.		Coastal areas 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.	Areas 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
To see how nature intends it to be. Need reserves as start for re-establishment of areas fished out by greedy fishers. Otherwise we will have a lot of underwater deserts.		None		Yes
Support proposal if on a smaller scale. Boat & fish in the Barrier area & target kingfish, game fish & snapper & use area for anchorages.		Areas 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 1 & 2 & northern half of 4.	Yes
Preserve and increase marine life in limited reserve. Recreational fishing should be permitted around Rakitu Island & across to adjacent coast as is only sheltered area for cruising boats. Due to exposed nature of coast, the impact of recreational fishing is limited due to small number of boats in area.	None	Area 4 & area around Rakitu Island.		Yes
We view the island daily from our home so feel connected to the place. Better emotional balance, marine reserves offer regenerative sources for adjacent ocean areas.				Yes
As per the purpose and expected benefits.				Yes
Limitations to recreational fishing rights are neither fair nor reasonable. Marine reserves should be in less accessible areas for less impacts on peoples' rights. One benefit might be stopping commercial fishing & illegal harvesting in area. Popular recreational fishing areas should be excluded from reserve proposal.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7.	Area 8.	Yes
Visit area 2-3 times per year and this is the best side for fishing activities.				Yes
Original involvement in island was as a DOC hunter controlling goats on island. The magic of GBI to me is to take a fishing rod for a walk and catch a feed, where and when I want. Hunting has gone from island & if fishing is unavailable I will not visit. It is unnecessary to include any of area in a marine reserve. DOC doesn't have any organised plan to create marine reserves & needs to rethink strategy. Barrier is expensive to live on, don't take away fishing rights.		Areas 1, 3, 4 & 5.		Yes & letter
Damn good idea, amazed there is not one here already. Would lead to better fishing overall & great snorkeling. Customary fishing for pipi should be allowed. Policing will be important - who will police it & how? Commercial boats especially should be kept out, otherwise will further alienate people on island.	Part			Yes
Amount of people using this area is minimal on world standards. Recreational fishing would have no impact based on current use. We have enough reserves for future generations. Already enough rules and regulations. Leave something for the recreational fisher.	All	All		Yes
Satisfaction of knowing at last a marine reserve has been established. Consider again the proposal put forward in 1994 by the Steering Committee.				Yes

520	Undated	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC									Y	QS	
521	Undated	Newmarket	Auckland			Y					O			1		1	1	1			N	OO
522	Undated	Torbay	Auckland				Y				O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
523	Undated	St Heliers	Auckland	Waitemata Harbor & Gulf Protection Society (Secretary)			Y				OC			1	1	1	1				Y	S
524	Undated	Pakuranga	Auckland	Auckland Harbours Users Association (Vice Chairman)				Y			OC			1	1		1				Y	S
525	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1		1				N	OO
526	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
527	Undated	Papatoetoe	Auckland					Y			OC			1							N	OO
528	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
529	Undated	Howick	Auckland						Y		N										N	OO
530	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y				OC			1							N	OO
531	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y				OC			1		1	1				N	OO
532	Undated	Paihia	Bay of Islands				Y				O			1			1				N	OO
533	Undated	Panmure	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1	1	1			N	OO
534	Undated	Medlands	Great Barrier Is		Y						O			1	1		1				N	OO
535	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
536	Undated	Remuera	Auckland						Y		N										N	OO
537	Undated	Clarks Beach 1850	Auckland					Y			OC	1		1	1	1		1			N	OO
538	Undated	Westmere	Auckland				Y		Y		O			1		1	1		1		N	OO
539	Undated	Okupu	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
540	Undated	Okupu	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC			1	1		1			1	N	OO

In the future, the Barrier people will be enriched. I hope that some provision can be made for a limited harvest of shellfish from Whangapoua.	Part			Yes
Marine park is a better option. Fishing would be better on perimeter of reserve which is positive but a negative would be shore development & an increase in visitors. A marine park or reserve should have Whakatautuna Point as its southern boundary as this is an easily identifiable landmark. Some other issues need to be addressed including: concern about influx of commercial operators & visitors & thinks this needs to be managed, policing commercial operators in a reserve & funding for DOC for this enforcement activity, marine park vs. marine reserve - a park would be favourable as it would allow limited recreational fishing.		Area south of Whakatautuna Point.	Marine park in entire area.	Yes & letter
Rather than a reserve, reduce catch numbers or put more officers on the job. It is nice to be able to take my limit of pipis and cockles occasionally from estuary. The last 3 times I have visited GBI I have been unable to get to north-east side due to weather so there is no need to make it a reserve. Fish & crayfish restock themselves on a regular basis. Concerned about carrying fish on board as only safe anchorages are on north-east coast.	Part		South of Awana or Little Barrier Island.	Yes
None provided.				Yes
Auckland Harbour Users Association represents 3000 cruising boat members. Our members would visit most parts of the GBI coast annually. A few of our members would oppose, generally those who see their predatory fishing habits cramped. A protected area would enhance the enjoyment of the whole island. There should be no exclusions for any reason. This organisation solidly backed the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park & we see reserves of this type enhancing the concept.	None	None		Yes
It is little used now so keep it open. You should leave inshore areas alone & look at commercial fishing.	All	All		Yes
It is little used now so keep it open. You should leave inshore areas alone & look at commercial fishing.	All	All		Yes
Go elsewhere, keep open to recreational fishing only. I want to catch fish in all of the area.	All	All		Yes
It is little used now so keep it open. You should leave inshore areas alone & look at commercial fishing.	All	All		Yes
I have no involvement with Barrier & have never used the area. I feel there is enough protection of NZ fishing & coastline, enough reserves already in place. More protection is sufficient without taking away the right of an individual to catch a few fish.		All		Yes
Go elsewhere, keep open to recreational fishing only. I want to catch fish in all of the area.	All	All		Yes
Go elsewhere, keep open to recreational fishing only. I want to catch fish in all of the area.	All	All		Yes
Do not support because of the restrictions a reserve makes to my personal choice of activities as a NZ citizen.		All		Yes
I have a small yacht & don't use east side of island. If east side is closed the big commercial boats will put pressure on the fishery on the west side of the island. DOC is not thinking of our children being able to wet a line in the future. DOC has gone too far with regards to our fishing grounds.	Part	All		Yes
Area naturally protected due to remoteness and weather conditions. None should be a reserve. What about problems of sediment run-off and nutrient rich land inputs (as per enclosed article)?	All	All		Yes
Area is isolated enough to prevent over fishing. Try removing commercial fishermen first as the difference will be huge.				Yes
A reserve is final and does not fit this area. Control through fishing department is more appropriate e.g. existing legislation should be used.				Yes
Free access for all & education of the area for future generations, especially children, should be done instead. One benefit might be scientific study results. There are enough reserves now & management of them needs to be a priority.	All			Yes
We have been sailing to the Barrier for nearly 30 years. The weather conditions severely restrict the amount of time able to visit the north-east Barrier. The severe weather is a perfect custodian of natures bounty and beauty.				Yes
Not here. Make the reserve around Little Barrier Island.	All	All	Little Barrier Island.	Yes
I don't want it in my backyard & there are enough reserves at present. We collect shellfish and fish as part of out diet. Make a reserve in commercial fishing areas & then you might achieve something.	Part	Areas 1, 2, 3 & 4 & including Rakitu Island.	Areas 6, 7 & 8.	Yes

541	Undated	Okupu	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														O			1	1												N	OO					
542	Undated	Okupu	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														O			1	1													N	OO				
543	Undated	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														OC			1	1	1	1											N	OO				
544	Undated	Torbay	Auckland	Medland family (descendant)	Y	Y	Y													O	1		1	1	1	1	1											N	OO			
545	Undated	Penrose	Auckland	O B C Auckland (Commodore)																OC			1															N	OO			
546	Undated	Papakura	Auckland				Y													OC			1	1	1													Y	S			
547	Undated	Blockhouse Bay	Auckland				Y													O			1	1	1	1												N	OO			
548	Undated	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														O			1	1	1													1	N	QO		
549	Undated	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														OC						1												N	OO			
550	Undated	Mt Roskill	Auckland	North Shore Outboard Boating Club (past Commodore)																OC			1	1		1													N	OO		
551	Undated	Campbells Bay	Auckland			Y	Y													O			1	1	1	1													1	N	QO	
552	Undated	Whangaparapara	Great Barrier Is		Y															OC			1																Y	S		
553	Undated	Remuera	Auckland																	OC			1	1	1	1														N	OO	
554	Undated	RD 3	Warkworth			Y	Y													OC							1													1	Y	QS
555	Undated	Takapuna	Auckland	O B C Auckland (Member)			Y													OC			1	1	1															N	OO	
556	Undated	Fern Flat, RD2	Kaitia																	N																				Y	QS	

Not here, make the reserve around Little Barrier Island.	All	All	Little Barrier Island.	Yes
Not here, make the reserve around Little Barrier Island.	All	All	Little Barrier Island.	Yes
It will effect my food gathering. Extend the one at Leigh.	All	All	Extend marine reserve at Leigh.	Yes
Size of island & percentage of area of reserve will be too big. Proposed area is too large & covers only sheltered areas in easterly winds. My family has used area for last 135 years & has always respected the land & sea to restock naturally. Look at commercial areas or have micro-pockets of marine reserves around country.	All	Area between coast & 6 nautical miles.	Area between 6 & 12 nautical miles.	Yes
Do not support the way DOC is going about it. I favour the idea of partial controlled reserves. All areas should be available to recreational fishing but some areas should ban anchoring. Before reserves are established, current laws should be enforced. Other methods should be looked at e.g. ban barbs on hooks to allow fish to be returned to sea unharmed.				Yes
Skipper of police vessels in area. The area is of special interest and in protecting it, there will be an awareness of its role & value in the marine ecosystem.		None		Yes
Reduces drastically the rights of citizens to enjoy the benefits of their natural birthrights. No one ever benefits from the creation of such reserves.	All	All		Yes
Self employed marine farmer at Port Fitzroy. Was involved in initial marine reserve proposal with dives off Arid Island. Scientific evidence produced by Dr Floor Anthoni (NZ reef ecologist) & Dr Katharine Fabricus (Australian) shows that reserves will not increase fish stocks. Much of the time it is not possible to get around to north-east side of island because of weather conditions. If a reserve was established I think Dragon Island/Harataonga would be suitable as this area has similar characteristics of Leigh. I would not be adverse to a small reserve for scientific study. Dr Anthoni says only 4 of 16 marine reserves in NZ are successful.			Harotaonga & Dragon Island (part of area 4).	Yes & Letter
Area self monitored due to weather conditions. Restrictions can be made by Ministry of Fisheries regulations. A reserve here would put more pressure on other more accessible places on GBI coastline. Area would be impossible to undo once approved.	All	All		Yes
Fisheries are not DOC's responsibility. Protection of territory can be better adjusted by current regulations e.g. seasonal alteration to activities. No true, proven benefit to me or future generations if reserves are proliferated. There was no scientific reason/proof given in material distributed to public.				Yes
Owned a bach at Medlands for 30 years. Proposal takes up 25% of coastline & this is way in excess of 10% objective & treats local users unfairly. Reduce proposal to include area 3 & 7. Any reserve will restrict my right to recreationally fish & dive in this area. Also believes it will restrict his ability to moor in area. Public must have the right to appeal to the Environment Court. All of the so-called benefits of a marine reserve can be achieved by other methods e.g. proper enforcement of existing laws, limiting commercial fishing, reducing daily bag limits.	All	Areas 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 & 8.	Areas 3 & 7.	Yes & letter
None provided.				Yes
Do not support proposal because this is inappropriate use of the legislation as reserves are for scientific study only. This proposal will alienate the majority of users. There is a lack of scientific evidence supporting benefits of reserves. There are already ample of reserves for scientific study. DOC's application is vague & uses spin to hide reaction of local residents & can't be trusted to act in public interests. If protection is an issue, review Quota Management System.	All	All		Yes
A protected area would allow fish etc to breed & would also protect area from commercial fishing. All of estuary should be excluded as Barrier residents are quite dependant on fish and shellfish. Would not like to see DOC in sole charge of decision making or enforcement.	All	Areas 2, 4 & 5.	Areas 3, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
Unnecessary, no scientific reason. Quota management of commercial fishing is essential.	One rule for all	All		Yes
Would provide work in the maritime tourism industry & industry would flourish as a result of protection. Area should be set aside areas for bivalve harvesting for local people & an area for all types of fishing. DOC should consider setting aside areas for customary fishing.	Part	Part for fishing for locals		Yes

557	Undated	Claris	Great Barrier Is			Y						O			1				1	1	1	1		Y	QS
558	Undated	Avondale	Auckland				Y					N							1					Y	S
559	Undated	Avondale	Auckland				Y					OC							1					Y	S
560	Undated	Avondale	Auckland	Koresh Trust, Orama Trust, CSSP (Trustee)		Y	Y					O							1	1	1			Y	QS
561	Undated	East Tamaki	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1	1						N	OO
562	Undated	East Tamaki	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1	1						N	OO
563	Undated	Campbells Bay	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1	1						N	QO
564	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y							OC							1	1	1			Y	S
565	Undated	Orakei	Auckland 5				Y					OC			1	1	1	1						N	OO
566	Undated		Cambridge				Y					O			1	1	1	1						Y	QS
567	Undated	Milford	Auckland				Y		Y			OC			1	1	1	1						N	QO
568	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y					OC			1		1							N	OO
569	Undated		Orewa				Y					O			1	1	1	1						N	OO
570	Undated	Greenwood Park Village	Tauranga				Y					OC				1								Y	S
571	Undated		Nelson	Forest & Bird - Nelson/Tasman Branch (Treasurer & committee member)				Y				OC							1	1				Y	S
572	Undated	Albany	Auckland						Y			O			1									Y/N	QS
573	Undated	Takapuna	Auckland	Fishing club (member)			Y					O			1	1	1	1						N	OO
574	Undated		Dunedin				Y		Y			OC				1	1	1					1	Y	S
575	Undated		Not given				Y					OC			1	1								N	OO
576	4.07.03	Browns Bay	Auckland				Y					OC				1		1						Y	S

Live & own land adjoining Korotiti Bay & run a wildlife protection agency at Awana Bay. Reserve will increase biodiversity, leading to possible employment opportunities, educational benefits & recreational benefits. Rock fishing for residents should be allowed. Concern about increase in visitor numbers to Korotiti Bay, which is on boundary of current proposal so would like all of bay enclosed in reserve. There is a need to accommodate the fishing needs of Okiwi residents. GBI residents should have first option to operate concessions in area. Concern about how area will be enforced & the fact that area is in shipping lane & the possible effects of this on a reserve. Would like to see anchoring allowed in most of reserve.	Part for locals	Area south of Whakatautuna Point & 2 rock fishing spots at Waikaro Point & point south of estuary.		Yes & letter
Better environment.	None	None		Yes
It will benefit all people on the island & off the island. A valuable resource for NZ.				Yes
Reserve will provide a chance for fish stocks to regenerate & will eventually provide an educational resource for students & scientific study of marine biodiversity. Pipi beds not over harvested at present so no need for protection at this stage. There is not a huge amount of recreational or commercial in area but quite a few crayfish are taken by divers.	Part	None		Yes
Area inaccessible & weather & isolation protects it. Big shame not to be able to fish for a feed for dinner here.				Yes
Area inaccessible & weather & isolation protects it. Big shame not to be able to fish for a feed for dinner here.				Yes
Area is only accessible to a few people. No benefits to me. The proposal reduces the recreational boating area on GBI by 50%. People will be forced to use the other side so imagine the congestion & effluent problems? After a while, this will have an impact on island's economy.	All	Areas 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.		Yes
As trained marine ecologist, local tourism operator, dive enthusiast and resident, I am strongly in support.	None	None		Yes
The area is a wild, exposed piece of coast accessible to only the competent. It is not under pressure from recreational users & already acts as a marine reserve by virtue of this fact. Who is going to visit this area in great numbers, as it is too remote?		All		Yes
Benefits are for long-term interests & conservation.	None			Yes
It is too big. Area already a defacto reserve in the Navy area. Its remoteness protects it. Exclude the whole estuary or rotate areas of it. Studies should be conducted for smaller rotating reserves. Reserves should be managed by local boards, not by Wellington.	Part			Yes
I am a recreational fisherman, leave it open to recreational use.	All	All		Yes
We have a Quota Management System. Closing the outside of the Barrier will double the pressure on west side. Nature does its own conservation. How would it be policed?				Yes
None provided.				Yes
NZ will benefit having a marine reserve this size, with this range of marine ecosystems. All estuary should be protected as it will become important for study and to assess unprotected estuaries. We need to know more to manage better the marine area. Species like packhorse crayfish need protecting. Area will be great for diving.	None	None		Yes
I am a commercial fisher & support marine reserves but this area is too large so I can't support this one. Be realistic about the size of the reserve & its impact on commercial fishers. If you cut the size you have my support.				Yes
Already protected by weather. Marine reserves should be placed where they are easily accessible by the public. You should at least be able to troll in area 7.		Area 7.		Yes
Might get to see a packhorse cray & will see an abundance of underwater life. Also satisfaction from nature getting a fair go. Proposal should include more areas e.g. some of west coast as well. We need to give animals a little space.	None	None	Extend west around the Needles.	Yes
Too many restrictions to what one can participate in area. I will not answer other questions as DOC will interpret these in their favour.				Yes
Raises awareness, will reduce poaching, increase fish breeding, investment for future, protection of marine life & habitat, need more protected areas. This is NZ - the last place on earth.				Yes

577	1.07.03	Awana	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							O			1	1											Y/N	QS
578	1.07.03	Okupu	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							OC			1	1			1	1							N	OO
579	1.07.03	Pa Beach, Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							OC			1	1			1	1							Y	QS
580	1.07.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							O	1		1									1	1	Unsure	QS	
581	1.07.03		Wellsford	Rodney Fishing Club (Committee member)					Y				OC			1				1								N	OO
582	Undated	Birkenhead	Auckland						Y				OC			1	1			1								N	OO
583	2.07.03	RD 1 Tryphena	Great Barrier Is			Y							OC														Y	QS	
584	1.07.03	Pakuranga	Auckland						Y				N														Y	S	
585	1.07.03	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y								O	1	1	1					1	1						N	OO
586	3.07.03		Murupara			Y							O	1		1	1			1	1							N	QS
587	Undated	Newtown	Wellington			Y	Y						OC	1		1											1	Y	QS
588	3.07.03	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							OC								1							Y	QS
589	3.07.03		Omaio			Y							O	1		1	1			1								N	OO
590	Undated	Okiwi Rd	Great Barrier Is		Y								OC			1												N	OO
591	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y							O	1		1											1	N	OO

Support idea but not sure I want no-take areas over the large area proposed. There are alternatives that will provide a win-win situation e.g. allow limited catch by locals from rocks within reserve to allow them to catch a feed as they have always done. Keep commercial operators out. Such a reserve would receive good support from locals and would be easier to police. Current open slather system not viable option for resource and ecosystem management. Allow some take within 100 metres of shore & protect the rest on entire east coast of GBI.	Part for locals	Sustenance fishing should be allowed within 100m of shore.	Area from 100m shore outwards.	Yes
This is a major decision affecting future generations. I cannot accept that DOC need to lock up the area & therefore I am not convinced of the need of a marine reserve.				Yes
Tourism benefits. Retain non-commercial fishing by way of marine park on both sides a marine reserve. Such a large expanse of unenforceable (because of its size) marine reserve will act as a magnet for commercial fishers. Reserve needs to be smaller with more defined boundary.	All	Areas 1, 2, 4 & 5 should be a marine park rather than reserve.	Areas 3, 6 & 7.	Yes
Use area for regular sustenance fishing to feed family. If proposal is modified to include permitted use of estuary for locals then would support idea. Benefit would be personal knowledge that some of our special environment is protected. Will only support proposal if it does not exclude locals from customary use of estuary.	Part	Area 4.		Yes
Area has some of the best land based fishing areas available in close proximity to home.				Yes
There is no scientific evidence of benefits. There has been no analysis or public discussion where the vast majority of Barrier users live e.g. Auckland and Coromandel. Until this occurs, I view the proposal as agenda-driven ideological hogwash.		All		Yes
Benefits of increased marine life spreading around the whole island as well as financial benefits to island from tourism. Any conservation is good. People who enjoy shellfish as part of their lifestyle will have no alternative if the estuary area is closed - unlike fishers, who can go elsewhere. Concerned that area is too big to police & only the honest people will be restricted.	Part			Yes
Occasional visitor as a yacht owner. A reserve will improve fish stocks in entire Gulf, preserve unique area for my children & grandchildren to visit and dive, maintain species found and yet to be found. It is essential this reserve proceed as there are too few reserves, the future should be our main concern.	Part for iwi	None		Yes
Object strongly. A marine reserve will take away my customary rights to harvest seafood recreationally and professionally. To me an area is a food gathering area not a look and see place. I would like to know: the purpose of the reserve, how it is going to help me & my family now & in the future, why such a huge area, why DOC is trying to take away my right to use my customary fishing grounds?	All	All		Yes
I will lose my right to gather kaimoana and recreation sports. No benefit, just a restriction. Reserve some areas & leave some others.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3 & 4.	Areas 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
Support the principle. Have been a regular visitor to area for past 25 years, mostly at Whangapoua beach. I am prepared to accept that such a proposal means that I can't collect shellfish & fish in area - even in my lifetime I have seen decline in fish & shellfish populations on GBI. Concerned that proposal doesn't take local community into account. Other concerns include: size, lack of access for North Barrier residents to undertake traditional & customary fishing in area, lack of access to estuary resources, no clear articulation of threats to this area, no clear idea of where reserve fits in within framework of the Biodiversity Strategy goals for marine protected areas, lack of recognition of the need to take into account the impact of a marine reserve on the Whangapoua Basin land environment. Some provision needs to be made for customary harvest by local community.	Part	Areas 2 & part of 3.		Yes & letter
There should be provision in the Fisheries Act to bring this about, in effect creating exclusion zones for all trawling activities. Coast and estuary protected by remote location. I believe in the principle of a marine reserve on GBI coast & suggest Harataonga/Palmers Beach area is ideal.		Areas 2 & 4.	Harotaonga to Palmers Beach.	Yes & letter
I like the area as it is - un-spoilt & freedom to carry on as before. No benefit, just another restriction. Estuary is source of shellfish & floundering & general recreational activities.	All	All		Yes
None provided.				Yes
Resident, live in area. This is just another example of DOC walking over individual private people. Proposal is tyranny by a government department. There is no justification for reserve.	All			Yes

592	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y							O	1		1				1			1	N	OO
593	Undated	Newton	Auckland	Tauiri	Y	Y						O	1		1	1	1	1				1	Y	QS
594	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O	1						1	1			Y	QS
595	Undated	RD 2	Kuaotunu				Y	Y				OC			1		1						Y	S
596	Undated	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O			1	1	1						N	OO
597	Undated	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
598	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						OC			1	1	1	1					N	QO
599	Undated	NHPC	Auckland			Y	Y			Y		OC			1	1	1						N	QO
600	Undated		Whitianga				Y					OC			1								Y	S
601	Undated	RD 1	Whitianga	Universal			Y					OC				1	1				1	Y	S	
602	Undated	RD 1	Whitianga				Y					OC											Y	S
603	Undated		Whitianga 2856				Y					OC			1	1	1	1	1				Y	S
604	Undated	Blockhouse Bay	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
605	Undated	Manurewa	Auckland	Cavalier Sports Fishing Club			Y					OC			1			1					N	OO
606	Undated	Manurewa	Auckland			Y						OC			1	1		1					N	OO
607	Undated	Manurewa	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
608	Undated	RD Pukekohe	Auckland				Y		Y			OC			1		1						N	OO
609	Undated	Manurewa	Auckland				Y					OC			1								N	OO
610	Undated	Manurewa	Auckland				Y					OC			1		1						N	OO
611	Undated	Hillsborough	Auckland	Nga Puhi	Y	Y						O	1		1	1	1	1					N	OO
612	Undated	Point Wells, RD6	Warkworth				Y					O			1		1	1					N	OO
613	22.08.03	Beachlands 1705	Auckland				Y					N				1							N	OO

Resident in proposal area. Proposal has not been justified & attempts to do so deliberately deceiving. I will not support lies.	All	All		Yes
Resident of island for 30 years & am briefly off island. Proposal would provide management by ecosystem, something Quota Management System does not do. Would protect packhorse habitat & give fish a no-take habitat. Estuary should be seasonally protected as these are only shellfish beds on island. Estuary should be managed locally e.g. taiapure - ask Ngati Rehua. Don't take all north-east coast but leave northern end for fishers & divers.	Seasonal		Areas 1, 2 4 & 5 & part of 3.	Yes
Increased fish stocks, educational & tourist benefits, protection for future generations. Estuary should be allowed for customary harvesting with tangata whenua & locals to act as kaitiaki. Put a ring around whole island & allow recreational fishing by permit inside ring, administered by locals. Close area in spawning season & have marine reserve outside ring & DOC can administer that. Once fish stocks recovered, allow limited commercial fishing by locals only to provide jobs for islanders.	All			Yes
Protection of environment for future generations, observation of marine life, tourism. There is a greater need for marine life and natural resources protection.	None			Yes
Area too inaccessible for any general public benefit. The proposal has no support from residents. Instead: stop commercial fishing, reduce the number of fish taken at any one time, police fishing areas, have no-take periods during year for fish to grow. People who live on GBI are all conservationists in one way or another.	All	All		Yes
Proposal infringes on our rights to fish & dive in this area. Overwhelming GBI resident support against the proposal. The area is too remote & dangerous for any public benefit. Instead: exclude commercial fishing around GBI, ban fishing during spawning season, reduce daily take limits & fisheries policing.	All	All		Yes
Traditional food source to many. Perhaps a reserve from Miners Head to Aiguilles Island.	Part		Miner's Head to Aiguilles Island.	Yes
Proposal too grandiose & would prevent traditional recreational fishing & diving for food. Location, isolation & weather prevent most people other than locals from fishing in area. I cannot support proposal in present form but are not opposed to smaller localised reserves e.g. Okura estuary. Would like to see a ban on commercial fishing in all areas.	Part	Areas 1 & 2.		Yes
I support all marine reserves.				Yes
Peace in my being from being able to touch and connect with natural colourful nature and its full beauty.				Yes
Feeding lots of people in future, locking up more breeding grounds.				Yes
It will be a part of our marine environment that will be kept in harmony. This will have a positive effect on my personal feeling of wellbeing. I encourage you to protect as much coastal areas as you can.				Yes
Citizens birthrights would be drastically reduced by such areas. No benefit to me at all.	All	All		Yes
Would be of little use. We have enough reserves now. It would be another Cave Creek. Too costly to patrol. It is all New Zealanders water to fish where they choose.	All	All		Yes
Enough reserves already. I won't benefit.	All	All		Yes
Do not need any more reserves. I use this area for fishing & boating.	All	All		Yes
Recreational fishing, stress relief, there are other places for a reserve. There are enough areas that are inaccessible that could be used as a reserve.	All	All		Yes
Too many now.	All	All		Yes
Enough reserves already. Area is very rough meaning you can't get there all the time.	All	All		Yes
Own bach at Okupu. Have traditional dived, fished & gathered shellfish in this area with other friends & family members. This is my favourite marine area in NZ. Reserve will deny me from enjoying the fishing & diving this isolated coast has to offer. You should target some of the vast uninhabited coastal areas of NZ e.g. parts of the West Coast, Fiordland, Three Kings Islands etc.	All	All	Fiordland, West Coast, Three Kings Islands & other isolated areas.	Yes
We would be unable to use the sheltered areas for mooring during westerly weather between the Needles and Whakatautuna Point. A reserve taking in this area would not attract divers as the depth to which diving would be capable of would be too expensive. Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.		Areas 6 & 8.		Yes & Form letter
Have never been around that side of GBI & don't fish & dive but would like to be able to anchor there if we ever had the occasion to do so. Exclude the estuary so locals can collect shellfish & so people from Arid Island have access to get to the mainland.	Part	Area 5.		Yes

614	Undated	Newmarket	Auckland			Y													OC			1										Y	S
615	Undated	Kohimarama	Auckland				Y												OC			1	1	1							Y	S	
616	Undated	Kohimarama	Auckland			Y													O			1		1	1						N	OO	
617	Undated	Papakura	Auckland	Ardmore Helicopters Ltd (Chief pilot)		Y													O			1						1			N	OO	
618	Undated	Mt Eden	Auckland	Ngati Awa	Y														O												Y	QS	
619	Undated	Epsom	Auckland	Tau Iwi					Y										OC			1	1	1	1	1					Y	QS	
620	Undated	RD 1	Great Barrier Is	Forest & Bird - GBI section of Hauraki Gulf Islands branch (Committee member).	Y														OC									1			1	Y	QS
621	Undated	Bucklands Beach	Auckland			Y													OC			1									N	OO	
622	Undated	Huia	Auckland			Y													O			1	1	1	1							N	OO
623	Undated	Huia	Auckland			Y													OC			1	1	1	1							N	OO
624	Undated	PDC Paerata	Auckland			Y													O			1	1	1	1							N	QO
625	Undated		Warkworth			Y													O									1			1	N	OO
626	Undated	Medlands Bay	Great Barrier Is	Medland Family (historian/writer)	Y														O	1		1	1				1	1	1	1		N	OO
627	Undated	RD 1 Pukekohe	Auckland			Y													O			1		1	1							N	OO
628	Undated	Remuera	Auckland			Y													O			1	1	1	1							N	OO
629	Undated	Tologa Bay	East Coast				Y												OC			1		1								N	OO
630	Undated	RD 1	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													Not given													Y	QO

I feel DOC, Ministry of Fisheries & other authorities could do a lot more about protecting our environment e.g. look at pollution & dredging in Auckland Harbour, what about a closed season during spawning?, policing existing reserves better, stopping commercial slaughter off & around the Gulf. Benefit of a reserve is knowing some marine life is getting sanctuary. Greatly oppose excluding estuary for select minority. It will always be painful for some people affected by this proposal today.	None		Arid Island & north to the Needles as a minimum.	Yes
Protection of marine life will provide joy for future generations. May be some positive spin off to marine health of the rest of the Hauraki Gulf.				Yes
Too limiting on average person to be able to fish in safety. If you have fish on board and need to shelter in marine reserve, do we have to dump catch?				Yes
This would prevent our low impact local/tourist heli-fishing operation. No benefit at all. I have flown to many remote areas of the NZ coastline - some of these would make good marine reserves without impacting much on users/residents.	All	All		Yes
Benefits will be for my children and grandchildren. Whole of estuary should be managed separately (e.g. close beds over summer) as it is the most reliable source of shellfish on the island. Leaving the back of Rakitu out will keep commercial fishers happy. Would prefer the boundaries I have marked.	All		Areas 2, 4 & part of 5.	Yes
Reserve would be good for Aotea & Hauraki Gulf. However, growing up on GBI & using estuary to gather food is a custom too precious to lose. Regulate estuary instead - 2nd & 3rd generation families who live near have collected from the area all their lives & it seems unfair to deny them shellfish gathering. Exclude area 3 to allow boats to anchor in area. Incorporate Navy zone. Need to compensate/compromise with the locals.	All	Area 3.	Include Navy zone.	Yes
Conservation concept is beneficial to all, especially future generations. Local iwi concerns & values should be addressed in relation to estuary. With all the public opposition to DOC at present, I favour area 4 which was received more favourably in the 1990s. If this worked, could expand area later.	Part for iwi & locals	None	Area 4	Yes
Area relatively un-spoilt as is, it will cost to police reserve, better to limit recreational fishing. I am in favour of the public treating our natural resources with respect. I am not in favour of total bans policed by taxpayer funded staff. Education, not more marine reserves, is the answer.	All	All		Yes
Area inside Arid Island offers a safe fishing spot & anchorage. I troll through area. This area is the closest hapuka grounds to Auckland. It will not happen because so many Aucklanders are upset at the lack of consultation.		None		Yes
No fishing, no diving.	All	All		Yes
All the overnight anchorages are taken up as well as swimming and surfing beaches and fishing and diving areas.	None	Areas 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6.		Yes
People live there & there are other areas without people that can be used e.g. entire top fifth of GBI, Mercury Island etc. Current laws protect sea life but are not being enforced by DOC. A better alternative would be GBI community having control over their lands & sea.	All	All	Mercury Islands, top fifth of GBI.	Yes
There are enough areas in marine reserves & closed to fishing & anchoring. None of the people who use this area would benefit from a reserve as we would lose our rights to catch fish & collect crayfish & shellfish. Your distribution list is biased as there are many on it who do not live here or visit at all. People who depend on this area for food as I do should be compensated as they will have to travel to other areas.	All	All coastline.		Yes
This is one of the main areas we fish & dive. We wouldn't benefit.	All	Areas 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7.		Yes
We do not believe it is necessary.		All		Yes
No good reason. Already enough protection with the Navy area & research can take place there.				Yes
Support the concept of a marine reserve in principle but see proposal in current form as unworkable and untenable. The proposal would be impossible to supervise, police or administer. We have witnessed commercial poachers & visitors who take more than the legal amount of fish & crayfish. Also concerned about impairment of the ability of local residents & tangata whenua to gather kaimoana. Many residents rely on this for food. As an alternative, we suggest a smaller area & that it be administered by tangata whenua.	All	Areas 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 & 8.	Areas 3 & 7 & around to north-west side (Miner's Head to Rangiwahakea Bay, encompassing the Needles & Aiguilles Islands).	Letter

631	Undated	RD 9	Dargaville	Hale family (member)			Y				O	1		1	1	1	1				N	OO
632	Undated	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O	1		1	1	1	1	1			N	OO
633	Undated	Kaitoke	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC			1	1	1	1				Y	QS
634	Undated	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC	1			1		1				Y	QS
635	Undated	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y						OC						1				Y	QS
636	Undated	Pakuranga	Auckland	Neptune Fishing Charters (owner/operator)			Y		Y		O			1	1		1	1		1	Y	QO
637	Undated	Waiuku	Auckland	Driftwood Lodge (Director)		Y	Y				O	1		1	1	1	1				N	OO
638	Undated	Browns Bay	Auckland				Y				O			1	1		1				N	OO
639	Undated		Warkworth				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
640	Undated	Bucklands Beach	Auckland				Y				N										Y	S
641	Undated		Warkworth				Y		Y		O			1		1	1				N	OO
642	Undated	RD	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC			1		1	1				N	OO
643	Undated	New Brighton	Christchurch						Y		O			1			1				Y	QS
644	Undated	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is			Y					OC			1		1	1				Y	QS
645	Undated	Grey Lynn	Auckland				Y				OC						1				Y	S

Not need because of current abundance of sea life and kaimoana. None of estuary should be included. As a fourth generation New Zealander I feel it is my right to gather seafood. Laws have been put in place for quotas and limits on all kaimoana and we never exceed these. The Hale family have been landowners on island for 6 generations - what compensation would they get?	All	All		Yes
Current fisheries are being mismanaged & current legislation is not being upheld. The proposed area is hugely important for GBI and its people. Our rights to feed ourselves & our families needs to be protected first, before the marine area. Until huge changes are made to management of our inshore fisheries, this proposal asks too much.	All	All		Yes
If reserve encompasses breeding sites for fish, then fish populations should increase. Eco-tourism should also increase, leading to employment opportunities. Need to protect customary fishing rights in estuary and wider area. Fisheries and breeding sites are being mismanaged by Ministry of Fisheries. DOC needs to pressure the government for vast improvements here before asking people to give up customary rights.	All	Customary fishing areas.		Yes
Do not support present boundaries. Support areas 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8 being marine reserve & areas 1, 2 & 4 having sustenance fishing only.	All	Areas 1, 2 & 4.	Areas 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
Support reserve providing: restricted area for shellfish gathering, possibility of beach fishing for locals will be discussed, people on Arid Island may sustenance fish, & the Okiwi airstrip will not be affected.	Part	Sustenance fishing should be allowed from Arid Island & beaches.		Yes & letter
Expect only detriment & no benefit. Onus is on those proposing reserve to provide independent scientific support as to the reason for the reserve. DOC & other parties should be required to submit total reserve plan for our territorial waters with options to be considered by the public before any reserves are approved. Run a charter business & during months of May - November I offer 3-day or longer trips to GBI. The eastern side of island offers us the most protection from prevalent winds. At anchor in evenings at Arid Island we catch baitfish. All hapuka grounds are included in this proposal. Much of proposal includes waters too deep for most divers. Agree with principles of marine reserves but do not support this one. It will greatly affect my business. Could possibly support a smaller reserve.	None	Areas deeper than 30 metres (includes areas 5, 6, 7 & 8).	Areas 1, 2 & 4 including some of Rakitu Island.	Yes & letter
There is no need to stop the recreational person, just stop all commercial operations around Barrier.	All	All		Yes
Nothing is being threatened or at risk. There is no benefit. Although the area proposed is a good example of marine ecology a reserve will not do anything except ban fishing, which is not justified. The proposal cannot be justified under the Marine Reserves Act and should be discontinued.	All	All		Yes
Enough reserves already. I want to see a strategic plan of proposed marine reserves in place before more reserves are made.				Yes
Nursery for all sea life.				Yes
No need for marine reserve if commercial fishing was better controlled.				Yes
Commercial fishing is uncontrolled & impacts on fish stocks & the environment more than recreational activities. Control commercial activities before locking up such a large area. Idea that estuary may be excluded seems an overt attempt to buy local support - this would increase pressure on an important nursery area. Reserve must be smaller. Locking up this area would force people further out to sea. DOC is not responsible for the fish stocks. The island's economy would benefit far more from a ban on commercial fishing. Reserve will increase pressure on other areas including Cuvier & Mokohinau Islands. There are also safety concerns. The entire DOC process regarding this proposal, including the questionnaire, seems suspect.		None		Yes & letter
Part time resident of island. Have snorkeled at Goat Island & think it would be great to have similar area on GBI to bring visitors to area. Maybe should exclude areas where shellfish can be gathered. Get Ministry of Fisheries to increase patrols regarding illegal fishing activities.	Part			Yes
Reserve will be a place to snorkel where I can see some sea life. Increased tourism. I feel that proposed area takes away too many areas where seafood is harvested. There needs to be an area to gather shellfish & windows where people can fish. Perhaps the reserve could be further north & exclude Awana & Harataonga.	Part			Yes
Marine reserves are important way to help preserve our sea life.				Yes

646	Undated	Bucklands Beach	Auckland				Y												O					1												Y	S			
647	Undated	Claris	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y													O					1	1	1	1									N	OO		
648	Undated	Claris	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y													O					1			1	1								N	OO		
649	Undated	Freemans Bay	Auckland				Y													OC					1	1	1	1									Y	QS		
650	Undated	RD5	Warkworth					Y												OC					1			1	1								N	OO		
651	Undated	Medlands Bch	Great Barrier Is			Y														O					1	1	1	1									N	QO		
652	Undated	Henderson	Auckland	Forest & Bird - Waitakere Branch (Committee member)				Y												OC					1	1	1	1									Y	S		
653	Undated	Titirangi	Auckland	Forest & Bird - Waitakere Branch (Co-chairperson)				Y												OC					1	1	1	1									Y	S		
654	27.06.03	Te Puna, RD6	Tauranga	NZ Fishing Industry Guild (Tauranga Port President)						Y										O					1													N	OO	
655	27.06.03	Rowesdale	Tauranga					Y												OC					1													N	OO	
656	27.06.03		Tauranga				Y			Y										O					1	1			1	1								Y	QO	
657	27.06.03	Otumoetai	Tauranga				Y		Y											O					1													N	OO	
658	27.06.03	Silverdale	Auckland	NZ Fishing Industry Guild (member)				Y												OC					1											1		N	OO	
659	27.06.03	RD6	Tauranga					Y												OC					1													N	OO	
660	27.06.03		Tauranga	NZ Fishing Industry Guild (member)						Y										O					1														N	OO
661	27.06.03	Glen Eden	Auckland				Y			Y										O					1	1	1	1	1										N	OO
662	27.06.03	RD6	Tauranga	NZ Fishing Industry Guild (National President)				Y												O					1	1			1										N	OO
663	27.06.03	RD6	Tauranga							Y										OC					1														N	OO
664	27.06.03		Tauranga																	O					1														N	OO
665	27.06.03		Mt Maunganui					Y												OC					1														N	OO
666	30.06.03		Leigh	Leigh Fishermen's Association																Not given																			N	OO
667	27.06.03	Henderson	Auckland					Y												OC					1														N	OO

Better scuba diving because of increased marine life. It is vitally important to establish as many marine reserves as soon as possible, before we end up with a barren, fished-out coast.				Yes
The area takes care of itself. From January - March weather prevents fishing & diving totally & using the area is always weather dependent. Why not Little Barrier Island?				Yes
Area protects itself because of weather conditions. We voted against this once before and my feelings are the same now.				Yes
The entire region will benefit from the creation of what is effectively a nursery for all local & pelagic species. Modest recreational harvesting of shellfish should continue in estuary. I haven't heard one good reason that was not based on greed, self-interest to exclude any other areas.	Part	None		Yes
Because I enjoy recreational fishing & want my children to enjoy it as well.				Yes
Area is naturally protected because of its location. Estuary is only place on GBI to collect pipis & cockles. DOC doesn't know anything about the marine environment - what about the poison drop on Little Barrier Island & the run off that will affect that marine environment?	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.		Yes
Support proposal for all reasons outlined in brochure. It will also provide better access for kite-surfing & better diving opportunities.	None	None		Yes
Improved fishing outside reserve, greater biodiversity in reserve, retaining unique character of coast & preservation of endangered species. Can you make it bigger?	None	None		Yes
Commercial fishermen for 30 years. There has been little evidence of any effect on environment by the activities taking place in last 20 years. No one will benefit except for people in conservation lobby. Not a good location as area is hard for public to access. Area is too large & is in pristine condition. The fishing industry is very regulated so that any new activity damaging the environment would not be tolerated.		None		Yes
I am a commercial fishermen & closure of the area would affect my livelihood.				Yes
I work on a commercial boat & when the south-westerly winds blow we anchor with recreational fishers in area & exercise our traditional rights to harvest a fair & proper share of seafood. I eat pipis & cockles so don't close entire estuary. Why not just make Navy zone bigger instead? Isolation of area protects it anyway.	Part	Areas 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 & 8.		Yes
I commercially fish outside this area but use the Barrier for shelter. The Quota Management System allows for protection so should fine tune systems that are already in place & leave the mostly honest people with access to good areas. Use areas 6 & 8 for purse seining & no fishing gear touches the bottom.		Areas 6 & 8.		Yes
All you need to do is restrict present fishing practices. According to your information, the treasure is there now despite of existing impact of humans. As a trawler there are many areas we are unable to fish & creating reserves will further displace us. Please note our impact on this area is minimal - we use it for anchorage in bad weather. The Quota Management System is working. I find it annoying the way you twist the truth.				Yes
The size proposed is too excessive to achieve a result. There is enough area here that trawlers cannot trawl. Why bother attempting to annoy so many New Zealanders for a few green votes?		Areas 5, 7 & 8.		Yes
As a commercial fishermen, it would affect my livelihood. I fish for skipjack tuna & mackerel in the summer months.		Areas 6 & 8.		Yes
Area is too large & isolated to be used often.				Yes
No need for it - your brochure outlines all the wonderful things in the area that are there now. DOC has a huge area at the Poor Knights that is protected from commercial fishing. Also cable & defence areas.	All			Yes
Achieves nothing.				Yes
None provided.				Yes
None provided.				Yes
Form submission: "I oppose the proposal for the above [Great Barrier Island] marine reserve. There should be no more marine reserves until such time as an overall strategic plan for whole of New Zealand is tabled to the public".				Form letter
None provided.				Yes

668	27.06.03		Tauranga	Fishing Industry Guild (member)				Y			OC		1							N	OO
669	27.06.03		Tauranga					Y			OC		1							N	OO
670	27.06.03	Glenfield	Auckland					Y			OC		1							N	OO
671	27.06.03		Auckland					Y			OC		1							N	OO
672	27.06.03		None given	Commercial fisher (Skipper)			Y				OC		1	1	1					N	OO
673	27.06.03	Massey	Auckland	NZ Maoris				Y			OC		1							N	OO
674	27.06.03	Takapuna	Auckland								Not given		1							N	OO
675	27.06.03	Dominion Rd	Auckland						Y		O		1	1		1				N	OO
676	27.06.03	Torbay	Auckland				Y				OC		1	1						N	OO
677	27.06.03	RD1	Kaeo	NZ Fishing Industry Guild (member)					Y		OC		1							N	OO
678	27.06.03	RD1	Kaeo	NZ Fishing Industry Guild (member)					Y		O		1	1		1				N	OO
679	27.06.03	Mount Maunganui	Tauranga	NZ Fishing Industry Guild (member)				Y			OC		1							N	OO
680	28.06.03	Paihia	Paihia						Y		O		1							N	OO
681	29.06.03	Papamoa	Tauranga						Y		OC		1							N	OO
682	29.06.03	Auckland Mail Centre	Auckland	NZ Fishing Industry Guild (official submissions)					Y		Not given		1							N	OO
683	10.06.03	Newton	Auckland	Auckland Conservation Board (Chairperson)							Not given									Y	QS
684	26.06.03	Ellerslie	Auckland	Ngati Wai o Aotea, descendants of Te Rangī Taungahuhu Tasman Davies		Y					Not given									N	OO

This proposal will take another area from the commercial sector. No benefit, just more restrictions. Gather all the information possible about fish stocks & depletion of the area.		None		Yes
None provided.				Yes
None provided.				Yes
None provided.				Yes
No need for any more reserves, far too big an area.				Yes
Because it takes away 170 nautical miles of coastline.	None	None		Yes
The area is far too large.				Yes
Not necessary as there is no perceived threat. As the pictures in the brochure show, there is an abundance of marine life. The Quota Management System protects this area from exploitation. Area is in a healthy state & recreational & commercial can continue to use it. The cable area is already closed off.		None		Yes
Because it takes up 174 nautical miles & due to Navy zone.	All	All		Yes
Plenty of marine life, don't need a reserve.	All	All		Yes
Cannot see what a marine reserve would accomplish.	All	All		Yes
Marine area is fine and doesn't require a reserve.				Yes
The area is naturally sustainable as is. A reserve is not needed.	All	All		Yes
No need for a reserve as area is looked after by Quota Management System and weather. There is already a reserve at the Poor Knights & other closed areas.	All	All		Yes
The NZ Fishing Industry Guild is a union, the 980 members of which are involved in commercial fishing. We oppose this proposal because: 1) The size sets a precedent & is too greedy. 2) We see no evidence of environmental degradation in this area. 3) Marine reserves do not rebuild fish stocks. 4) The reserve would not act as a fish breeding ground. 5) The Poor Knights marine reserve provides ample opportunity for people to see fish & marine life in their natural habitat. 6) Marine reserves do not need to be large e.g. Leigh is successful & is small. 7) If the local GBI residents don't want this reserve, we believe DOC must rethink its strategy. 8) This reserve would have a highly negative impact on fishing in this area, both commercial & recreational. It will cost jobs & irritate a large section of voting public who enjoy fishing. Note: submission has been signed by 36 members, many of whom put individual submissions in.				Letter
The ACB strongly supports the concept of a marine reserve in this area. In recognition of the distinctive marine ecological areas, the size needs to be the maximum that can be reasonably achieved. Factors in favour of a reserve at this site are: 1) Integration of land/sea conservation. 2) As we understand it, the area is not at present a significant commercial fishing area. 3) Factors such as weather and accessibility reduce the strength of opposition arguments from recreational fishers. We note there are significant issues in relation to customary & local use of inner estuary area so mechanisms for customary/local take need to be explored. We note concerns from some sectors of the public about the public consultation process for this proposal - our concern relates to the possibility of this leading to widespread mistrust of DOC's objectives.	Part			Letter
We oppose the proposal. We are disappointed, as rightful owners of the land [at Katharine Bay] that we have not been consulted at an early stage & have not been given much time to lodge an objection. The DOC brochure fails to accommodate tangata whenua needs. Our children are the third generation of our family on this island & they want to enjoy the full benefits of the land left to them. These benefits include being able to gather fish & shellfish. The remoteness of the island means some food is not bountiful. We rely on seafood to sustain ourselves. To deny us fresh seafood is to deny our children their survival on the island.	All			Letter

685	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y						OC								1							Y	QS
686	Undated	RD 6	Warkworth	Warkworth Big Game Fishing Club			Y		Y	O	1		1	1	1	1										N	OO
687	Undated		Auckland 1005		Y	Y				O			1	1	1	1										Y/N	QS
688	Undated		Whangarei				Y			OC			1	1	1											Y	QS
689	Undated	RD 1 Hikurangi	Whangarei	Experiencing Marine Reserves (programme coordinator)			Y			OC					1	1										Y	S
690	Undated	Half Moon Bay	Auckland	NZ Recreational Fishing Council (submission on behalf of Council)						Not given																N	OO
691	Undated	RD 5	Warkworth	Commercial fisher (Owner/operator)			Y		Y	O		1	1	1	1										1	N	OO
692	Undated		Leigh 1241	Glass Bottom Boat (Directors)			Y			OC			1	1	1	1										Y	S
693	Undated	Blockhouse Bay	Auckland			Y	Y			O			1	1		1									1	N	OO
694	Undated	RD4	Papakura				Y			O			1													N	OO
695	Undated	RD 1	Great Barrier Is		Y					OC						1										Y	S

Benefits include economic benefits through tourism, ability to view natural undisturbed marine life, & increased fish stocks in surrounding areas. It will be difficult to totally restrict adjacent landowners who do often fish in the area - a tricky issue but maybe licensing locals or excluding an area for them to use. The government's fishing quota system is poor - commercial fishing needs to be addressed before it is too late. In reality mainly the local commercial cray fishers that fish there and the way they strip the ocean is criminal. Another issue; quotas too high and not enough policing.		Areas for locals to fish e.g. next to Mabey & Hale properties.		Yes & letter
DOC greed with the size of this proposal has made opposition the only viable option until all issues are resolved. I would never visit this area if it was a marine reserve. The estuary is in pristine condition & is only accessible to a few & fisheries regulations are coping. DOC should listen to the people before it goes ahead. Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.	All	All		Yes & Form letter
I am resident for more than half of each year. A reserve is not necessary as recreational fishing is very light for most of the year. Large areas are never fished at all. Protect from commercial fishing only. Also put efforts into educating the public to care for environment. There is no scientific data to prove a reserve would be of benefit. The Navy area already acts as a reserve. Object to size of proposal but support a small marine reserve in area as it would show if there is any benefit. A reserve from Needles to point north of Whangapoua Beach & small one at Harotaonga would be sufficient without spoiling the recreational fishing opportunities. Exclude the estuary for light recreational fishing & areas adjacent to public land. Area is not heavily fished by recreational fishers.	All	Area 4 (except Harotaonga), plus 2, 5.	Area 3 & Harotaonga.	Yes & Option 4
Protecting the area will be of benefit for future generations. The proposed area is so large it is unlikely to get buy-in from locals. A smaller reserve may achieve support from the majority of local residents.	None	Areas 3, 6 & 7.	Areas 1, 2, 4, 5 & 8.	Yes
A marine reserve would be of great benefit to students of GBI. I could help coordinate educational activities within the new marine reserve. A marine reserve would conserve biodiversity & provide a focus for marine education in the area.				Yes
The Council is not opposed to marine reserves - they have a place in marine management but are only one tool. We suggest DOC contacted the Council at an early stage, as it did with locals & iwi. Questionnaire is misleading & loaded to give supportive view. Concerned about how DOC advertised this proposal. Iwi have not been fully consulted. Concerned the proposal removes the only sustainable shellfish gathering area on GBI. GBI is very significant to the Auckland boating public. Marine reserves are not a fisheries management tool. It talks of national parks of the sea but fails to state that the public can hunt for sport, food & sustenance in a national park but cannot do so in a marine reserve. Identify species that are at risk in the proposed area first and then decide how to isolate that risk. Look at other protection tools not just marine reserves. It has been suggested the magnitude of the proposal is designed to introduce an element of scaremongering to encourage the public to accept a lesser proposal at a later date.				Letter
Because it will be an offence against the Act to even take shelter & have a fish on board. I don't trust you unless the Act is changed. If proposal goes ahead, my fishing quota will be devalued & I will lose a significant part of my pilchard & tuna fishery. Protect all cable areas instead as they are already charted as no-take areas.	All		Cable areas around New Zealand.	Yes
Once fish stock regenerate in the area there will be an out flowing seeding effect of all species to other parts of the Hauraki Gulf. Our observations show it is apparent that a lot of immigrants do not understand the meaning of a marine reserve so more education is needed.				Yes
It means I can't fish there.	All	All		Yes
What studies have been done to show that this area is under threat? People would maybe consider your aims more favourably had you consulted more widely and not put your own spin on results from meetings at the Barrier.				Yes
Future generations will benefit if areas are protected from the ever-increasing over fishing and gathering.	None	None		Yes

696	Undated	RD 1	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y												OC										1								Y	S			
697	Undated	RD 4	Taumarunui				Y												O																			N	OO		
698	Undated		Whitianga					Y											OC																		Y	QO			
699	Undated	Thames	Thames					Y											OC																			N	OO		
700	Undated	Onehunga	Auckland				Y												OC																		Y	S			
701	Undated	RD 10 Waimate	South Canterbury					Y											OC																			1	Y	S	
702	Undated	Glenfield	Auckland	Breakaway Fishers Club (President)				Y											OC																				N	OO	
703	Undated	Sandspit RD2	Warkworth					Y											O																				N	OO	
704	Undated	Mt Roskill	Auckland					Y											OC																					N	OO
705	Undated	RD 4	Warkworth					Y											OC																					Y/N	QS
706	Undated		Matakana					Y											O																					N	OO
707	Undated		Matakana					Y											OC																					N	OO
708	Undated	Hillsborough	Auckland					Y											O																					N	OO
709	Undated	Pukekohe	Auckland					Y											O																					N	OO
710	Undated	Greenlane	Auckland					Y											OC																					N	QO
711	Undated	Hillcrest	Auckland					Y											OC																					Y	S

Anyone who lives on the coast, or fishes & dives can benefit from a protected area & especially if it includes an estuary. There is a huge amount of coastal waters around NZ in proportion to this proposal - this marine reserve is a drop in the bucket. I think encompassing the coast and offshore waters makes complete sense. My only concern is how it would impact on residents in immediate area (sustenance fishing, shellfish gathering).				Yes
Recreational fishers are having a minimal impact on the area. Isn't the Navy area enough non-fishing area? What research has been done in this area? In westerly winds there is intense commercial fishing activity in area so perhaps introduce regulations on commercial operators e.g. 3-hook maximum.	All			Yes
Reserve would restrict my charter business. Estuary should not be included. Western side of Arid Island is the only place on that side of GBI that is sheltered in easterly conditions. All of areas 1, 2, 4 & 5 are too widely used to be closed off. The far northern tip of GBI would be suitable for a small reserve, as would the area around the Navy zone. DOC are only seeking to create a dynasty for themselves. I would recommend to recreational fishers that they refuse to cooperate with this plan.	All	Areas 1, 2, 4 & 5.	Area south of Whakatautuna Point including the Navy zone or the north-eastern tip of GBI including the Needles & Aiguilles Islands.	Yes
Area is already in Hauraki Gulf Marine Park & commercial fishing is already controlled. Scientists should stop penalising recreational fishers. The concept of a marine reserve is philosophically flawed. Do not include anchorages at Arid Island & Harataonga Bay.	All	Anchorage at Arid Island & Harataonga Bay.		Yes
Very supportive. Reserve will lead to regeneration of fish and shellfish stocks, improved tourism opportunities, conservation of species, snorkeling in protected area. Perhaps exclude an area for iwi to collect shellfish but of no concern to me. If I can be of help, please contact me.	Part for iwi			Yes
It will allow fish species and sea bed (corals etc) will flourish, thus make it an exciting place to dive and see increased sea birds.				Yes
If DOC are concerned about conservation, stop trying to deny the public the pleasure of fishing & diving in areas where you have a good chance of catching dinner. DOC's energy would be better channeled into investigating abhorrent fishing methods by the commercial sector such as long-lining & the cutting of sharks fins. I do not agree with this proposal - the area is remote enough and not under threat from recreational fishers. Threat is from commercial fishing with the Quota Management System seeing the dumping of excess stock at sea. Barrier isn't accessible by car so how many people would benefit from this? Ban commercial fishing & impose tougher penalties for those breaking law.				Yes
Area self governing by nature of location and weather. Protect only the Navy area.	All		Navy area.	Yes
Too close to an extensive summer recreational boating area. You couldn't police it from commercial plundering. I have had first-hand experience of this at Omaha Bay.				Yes
Will we still be able to anchor & swim there? The coastline will be in pristine state forever if a reserve. The cockles and pipis should be able to be collected by family groups. A wonderful idea.	Part			Yes
The proposal is over the top & will not provide benefit. The whole issue needs to be revisited with proper consultation with user groups. Recreational fishers do not have an issue with marine reserves & see the benefits but the scale of this proposal is ridiculous. I resent the arrogance that pervades the present administration & perhaps political action will be the result.				Yes
Proposed are too large. I have seen blatant abuse of smaller reserves which are not properly policed. The only people who will be affected are the responsible fishers. A large reserve will just mean other areas are over-fished. Would be better to put resources into existing enforcement.				Yes
This area is excellent for small boats and fishing and very different to other areas of the Barrier. Boaties are unable to get here 90% of time, due to weather conditions.		All		Yes
This area is excellent for fishing & diving. The whole coastline should be excluded. It is remote enough to self protect and access is controlled by weather conditions.		All coast.		Yes
Do not support proposal in current form as the area is too large. The constant rough weather means the area self preserves. A smaller area could benefit all.				Yes
Reserve will improve snorkeling, protect fish stocks, meaning improved fishing, protect a range of underwater habitats for their own sake, & benefit the Hauraki Gulf generally.	None	None		Yes

712	Undated	Algies Bay	Warkworth				Y					OC			1	1	1	1										N	QO
713	Undated	Okupu	Great Barrier Is									O	1		1		1	1									1	N	OO
714	Undated	Okura	RD2 Albany				Y					OC			1	1	1	1	1									Y	QS
715	Undated		Whitianga	Ngati Hei			Y					O	1		1	1	1	1	1								1	N	QO
716	Undated	RD 1	Whitianga	Forest & Bird - Mercury Bay branch (Committee member)				Y				N																Y	S
717	Undated	Remuera	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1											N	OO
718	Undated	Market Rd	Auckland				Y					OC			1		1											N	OO
719	Undated	St Heliers Bay	Auckland	Outboard Boating Club Auckland (member)								N																N	OO
720	Undated	Castor Bay	Auckland				Y					OC			1		1											N	OO
721	Undated	Papakura	Auckland				Y					OC			1	1	1											N	OO
722	Undated	Westharbour	Auckland				Y					OC			1		1											N	OO
723	Undated	Mairangi Bay	Auckland			Y	Y					O			1				1									N	QO
724	Undated		Orewa									N																Y	S
725	Undated	Albany	Auckland				Y					OC			1	1	1											N	OO
726	Undated	Albany	Auckland				Y					OC			1				1	1								N	OO
727	Undated	Albany	Auckland				Y					OC			1				1									N	OO
728	Undated	Browns Bay	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1	1										N	OO
729	Undated	Waiake 1311	Auckland				Y								1	1	1											N	OO

Would support proposal only if it was around Arid Island & not all the other areas. Reserve will only make more people fish on other side of Barrier. I would lose a lot of the joy of going around the back of Barrier. Area is protected by weather & isolation. Arid Island would make a good reserve but leave rest of area for people to use. The Navy area is effectively a marine reserve.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 & 8	Area 5.	Yes
DOC is not justified in trying to create a marine reserve here. I will only benefit if things are left the way they are. Other benefits will be for DOC only. A reserve would restrict my movements, food gathering, my right to fish where I want to go. I would like DOC to justify why they see fit to establish a criteria to moot a marine reserve on Barrier. I await your correspondence which will justify your position.	All	All		Yes
Have been life-long divers & users of proposed area & want to be involved in consent process. We were active advocates of Long Bay marine reserve. We support the Okura River Boating Club submission which has the following boundaries: similar in area but southern boundary should intersect Whangapoua beach & go through middle of Arid Island. We believe only half Arid Island should be included to allow for comparative scientific study. We would also like the sheltered anchorage on the island excluded from the reserve. A small marine reserve should also be located on the west coast of GBI as this area is more accessible for the public. Other priorities for marine reserve protection include: Minerva Reefs & Kaikoura Island.	All	Areas 4 & 8, & parts of 2 & 5.	Areas 3, 6 & 7, & parts of 2 & 5 & extend northern boundary further north.	Yes & letter
Do not support proposal because, if the weather dictates it, I could be trapped in the area & need to collect kaimoana to live off. I would not benefit from a reserve but the marine life would which is good. All of estuary should be excluded to allow for shellfish gathering. The shellfish beds are fully stocked. The proposal area is more intact with marine life than many other areas so it is unnecessary to make it a marine reserve. Protect a more damaged area, such as Port Fitzroy. I would fully support a ban on commercial fishing enterprise & a ban on all nets. Have been involved with marine reserves before but now think it is better to have a balance rather than a marine reserve - a big reserve will simply increase pressure in other areas.	All			Yes
Benefits to me are knowing that a significant area of marine environment which encompasses a good range of habitat types is safe & able to protect itself. Do not exclude estuary. We support efforts to protect a large area of this marine ecosystem.	None	None		Yes
It will remove my customary right to fish/dive in this area. No benefit, but a big loss to me & my family. A pointless & expensive exercise which is much better handled through fish quota management & reducing run-off via building regulations.	All	All		Yes
Not necessary. You cannot make a credible case for this reserve.	All	All		Yes
This area is an important recreational patch. While I don't fish here, others do. I am against any marine reserves so close to the Hauraki Gulf & would be concerned such a reserve would be extended.				Yes
No scientific evidence that it is needed or necessary. No supportive information that this will make any difference. Give me reasons why and how reserve will benefit anyone. This proposal is political, a non-scientific policy that will not achieve much except to annoy the fishermen & divers in NZ. If you take in offshore islands & non-anchoring areas you will reach the 10% target (a silly figure). I believe the questionnaire is biased.				Yes
Will affect our ability now & in the future to access the area. If we are concerned about the preservation of fish life, restrict and control commercial fishing.				Yes
I should be able to fish and dive where I want to. Keep the professional fishers out further to increase fish stocks then you will not need a marine reserve.				Yes
Too close to Auckland. Choose north area on each side opposite so easy to police & study. Marine reserves should be in remote areas & where fish are not declining.	None			Yes
I think more areas should be designated marine reserves.				Yes
Area has existing natural protection due to remote location & weather.		All		Yes
Status quo, no reserve.	All	All		Yes
Wants to retain status quo. Keep estuary for local harvesting.	All			Yes
Location is self protecting. Keep the status quo. Keep estuary for locals & sustained harvesting. Same goes for other parts of proposal.	All	All		Yes
Area protects itself with the location.				Yes

730	Undated	Torbay	Auckland				Y				O			1	1					N	OO	
731	Undated	Waiake	Auckland				Y				O	1		1						N	OO	
732	Undated	Torbay	Auckland				Y				O	1		1						N	OO	
733	Undated	Kohimarama	Auckland					Y			OC								1		N	OO
734	Undated	Kohimarama	Auckland 1005					Y			OC			1	1				1		Y	S
735	Undated	Maraetai	Auckland				Y				O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
736	Undated	Arch Hill	Auckland				Y				O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
737	Undated	Parnell	Auckland					Y			OC			1		1	1				Unsure	QO
738	Undated	St Heliers	Auckland				Y				N								1	Y	S	
739	Undated	St Johns	Auckland				Y				OC				1	1	1				Y	S
740	Undated	RD 5	Warkworth				Y				O	1		1	1	1	1				N	OO
741	Undated	RD 5	Warkworth				Y				O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
742	Undated	RD 5	Warkworth				Y				O	1		1	1	1	1				N	OO
743	Undated		Leigh 1241				Y				O			1		1					N	OO
744	Undated	Mangere Bridge	Auckland				Y				N			1							N	OO
745	Undated	Manurewa	Auckland				Y		Y		OC			1	1						Y	QS
746	Undated	Manurewa	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1						N	OO

Remote location that protects itself. No benefit, marine reserves don't work. Where is the science?	All	All		Yes
Location protects itself. No reserve.	All	All		Yes
Existing protection due to location. Not benefit.	All	All		Yes
Already adequate marine life at the Barrier without reserve. We should concentrate on sustainable fishing & diving quotas & thereby achieve the same effect. I see no reasons for further marine reserves - for what proportion of the NZ public is this reserve available when it is so far away?				Yes
I applaud your proposal, every part of which has my support. The extent and increasing rate of degradation of every aspect of the natural environment is something to be greatly deplored & the efforts of people like yourselves, with this marine reserve proposal, are common sense & wholly admirable. For the record, I have tramped all over the Barrier & Arid Island & fished, swum & moored in the waters around it on many occasions. You have my best wish in overcoming self-interested objections to the proposal.	None	None		Yes & letter
It is protected enough already by weather and locality. No reserve anywhere on Barrier.	All	All		Yes
Due to the low levels of visitors (because of weather patterns & distance), the area is not over used or over fished therefore not under threat & should be used as it is. No benefit to me because I can't do the activities I currently do. Leave it for New Zealanders to enjoy & respect.	All	All		Yes
The impression is that the proposal has been rushed and perhaps less transparent than required for support. I believe there are some more heavily damaged areas that would benefit more from protection than this area. I would be interested in discussing the possibility of a small reserve(s) on the eastern Coromandel peninsula. I dive there and over the years have noticed the smaller number & size of crayfish caught. My concern with this proposal is that the resentment generated by it will make it difficult to get people to buy into it.				Yes
I think it is time reserves are put in place to save the sea life for the future & not only on Great Barrier.				Yes
Benefits include protecting all marine species, establishing an area that will attract tourist divers. A marine reserve will be fantastic - the positive spin-offs from Poor Knights reserve are obvious.	None	None		Yes
As a conservationist, I believe in preservation of our environment but feel there is no scientific proof that marine reserves are necessary or if in fact they work. I would not benefit & wish to maintain my right to fish and dive in the area. I want to travel & anchor in this area with immunity from prosecution if we have fish, crayfish & fishing gear on board as we usually have - can you guarantee that?	All	All coastline.		Yes
I want to use this area for fishing and diving with family and friends without having boat taken off us.	All	All		Yes
I still want to fish there. I spend a lot of time in this area fishing and enjoying it with family.				Yes
Our family have enjoyed boating, fishing & diving around GBI for past 35 years. Live at Leigh & have watched Goat Island reserve over the years & believe the huge numbers of people drawn to the area have a far more detrimental effect on environment than if area had not been reserved. Admittedly, the GBI proposal is further afield & less accessible but believe that over time eco-tourism will have an adverse effect there. More enforcement of current recreational fishing regulations & sensible commercial management is sufficient to protect marine species in NZ waters. I object to this proposal for the following reasons: 1) Adjacent areas will have more fishing pressure. 2) Fishing is already prohibited in cable areas & Navy areas. 3) I want to continue fishing and diving here - what will happen if I fish further south & anchor in area with wetfish on board? 4) If DOC must have further reserves choose more remote areas e.g. Fanal Island, part of Hen and Chickens, Cuvier Island, part of Little Barrier Island.			Little Barrier, Cuvier, Fanal, or Hen & Chickens Islands.	Yes & letter
Too vast. Do not consider that estuary needs to be so highly protected, closing estuary at spawning time would surely be sufficient. Area would be virtually un-policable.	None	None		Yes
I do not support the scale of present proposal. The area I have marked would be better as it is easily accessible by public, a more practical area for administration and patrolling, area proposed is totally unfair to recreational fishers and local residents.	None	Areas 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 1, 2 & out to Rakitu Island.	Yes
I don't believe the area is over-fished. GBI is isolated & is not under any pressure regarding the fishery in the summer months.				Yes

747	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													O					1	1	1	1			1	N	QO
748	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y													O	1			1	1	1	1	1				Y	QS
749	Undated	Oratia	Auckland	Landsendt (Owner)		Y													OC								1				N	OO
750	26.06.03		Great Barrier Is	Ngati Wai	Y														O	1			1	1	1						Not given	OO
751	26.06.03		Great Barrier Is		Y														O	1			1	1	1						Not given	OO
752	26.06.03		Great Barrier Is		Y														O	1			1	1	1						Not given	OO
753	26.06.03		Great Barrier Is		Y														O	1			1	1	1						Not given	OO

Proposal will lock people out and there will be rules on the locals. Other areas will be hit harder. I believe a marine park could work if people won't be locked out. Our land borders the estuary & a reserve will mean more disturbance with DOC boats going past. You will not stop commercial fishing with a reserve - fish travel so they will be caught eventually. The sea is not being raped out here. Why isn't something being done about not fishing during spawning seasons? We are afraid people will not be able to get their food on an island where food is not easily obtained unless caught or grown. Why can't we have an agreement of our own, funded by the government.	All	Area 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 8.	Areas 6 & 7 could be a marine park.	Yes
Fish stocks could increase without commercial pressure on the area. Estuary should not be included. The government needs to accept that it is commercial pressure that is depleting our fish stocks & needs to address the issue.	All	Areas 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 & 8.	Areas 3 & 7 & Rakitu Island.	Yes
As a land-owner, we think it will affect the value of land as we know people come to Barrier to fish, walk etc. No benefit to us & people living on this property in the future will not be able to catch themselves a fish. The estuary & beach especially should not be included. We would like to see fisheries controlled, especially commercial fishing during spawning season. Why can't DOC do this?	All	Area 2.		Yes
I am a resident of GBI & regularly visit the north-east coast & exercise customary rights in relation to the sustainable gathering of fish & shellfish resources. My people have a history of undertaking conservation & resource management on Aotea & I am concerned DOC is planning to further erode of customary rights by proposing a marine reserve. I support moves to safeguard the resources of the island, but not this method as it will not allow us to undertake customary rights. We use all parts of the proposed area for gathering fish & shellfish. This is an imposition of non-Maori philosophies and practices of conservation which consign tikanga (customary practises) and kaupapa (traditional philosophies) to the "back seat". The proposal does not meet obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi. Over-use of resources is undertaken by predominantly non-Maori people. I suggest you reconsider the proposal & address those at fault - not our people.				Form letter
I am a resident of GBI & regularly visit the north-east coast & exercise customary rights in relation to the sustainable gathering of fish & shellfish resources. My people have a history of undertaking conservation & resource management on Aotea & I am concerned DOC is planning to further erode of customary rights by proposing a marine reserve. I support moves to safeguard the resources of the island, but not this method as it will not allow us to undertake customary rights. We use all parts of the proposed area for gathering fish & shellfish. This is an imposition of non-Maori philosophies and practices of conservation which consign tikanga (customary practises) and kaupapa (traditional philosophies) to the "back seat". The proposal does not meet obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi. Over-use of resources is undertaken by predominantly non-Maori people. I suggest you reconsider the proposal & address those at fault - not our people.				Form letter
I am a resident of GBI & regularly visit the north-east coast & exercise customary rights in relation to the sustainable gathering of fish & shellfish resources. My people have a history of undertaking conservation & resource management on Aotea & I am concerned DOC is planning to further erode of customary rights by proposing a marine reserve. I support moves to safeguard the resources of the island, but not this method as it will not allow us to undertake customary rights. We use all parts of the proposed area for gathering fish & shellfish. This is an imposition of non-Maori philosophies and practices of conservation which consign tikanga (customary practises) and kaupapa (traditional philosophies) to the "back seat". The proposal does not meet obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi. Over-use of resources is undertaken by predominantly non-Maori people. I suggest you reconsider the proposal & address those at fault - not our people.				Form letter
I am a resident of GBI & regularly visit the north-east coast & exercise customary rights in relation to the sustainable gathering of fish & shellfish resources. My people have a history of undertaking conservation & resource management on Aotea & I am concerned DOC is planning to further erode of customary rights by proposing a marine reserve. I support moves to safeguard the resources of the island, but not this method as it will not allow us to undertake customary rights. We use all parts of the proposed area for gathering fish & shellfish. This is an imposition of non-Maori philosophies and practices of conservation which consign tikanga (customary practises) and kaupapa (traditional philosophies) to the "back seat". The proposal does not meet obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi. Over-use of resources is undertaken by predominantly non-Maori people. I suggest you reconsider the proposal & address those at fault - not our people.				Form letter

754	Undated	Kawa	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														Y	QS								
755	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														Y	QS								
756	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														Y	QS								
757	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														1	N	OO							
758	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y															1	1	Y	S						
759	Undated	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														1		1	Y	S					
760	Undated	Okiwi PC	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y															1	1	N	OO					
761	30.06.03	Albany	Auckland				Y													OC		1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
762	Undated		Rotorua	Forest & Bird - Rotorua Branch (Committee member)			Y														OC		1	1				Y	S

Do not support the full area.	All	Areas 1, 2 & 4.	Areas 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
At my age, I think the younger generation will benefit from it more than I will. Would like whole estuary excluded as my family & I have caught flounder and gathered pipi for generations & still do. We need an area to fish in so exclude some areas.	All	Areas 1, 2 & 4.	Areas 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
I hope that marine life would increase to the stage that the next generations will enjoy the benefits that I have. Would like all the estuary excluded but maybe put a taiapure in this area. I would also like areas 1, 2 & 4 excluded & protected as a taiapure.	All	Areas 1, 2 & 4.	Areas 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
Fisheries need to be better managed. Shutting us out is not going to fix any problems. Look at the Navy area - 40 years old & very little difference to non-reserve areas. Estuary should not be a reserve - there are more pipis than ever & it is an important food gathering area for locals. My family has been here for 90 years & have only ever fished for sustenance. Eliminate the real problems e.g. fishing while spawning & commercial fishing. DOC cannot be trusted, as has been confirmed by blatant lies about so-called "local support". DOC are likely to change boundaries without consultation. My childhood memories are of rock and dinghy fishing. Why should this been taken away from future generations - DOC doesn't seem to care what a huge impact this would have. DOC's communication is shocking - keep us informed & be honest so we know what is happening.	All	All		Yes & letter
Pride that we are custodians of a priceless & precious snorkeling & diving resource. Peace of mind that as Barrier residents we were open minded enough to see that sometimes we have to give in order to gain. It is most important that the estuary is protected. To address issue of over fishing by commercial and recreational users, the Ministry of Fisheries regulations should be reviewed. However, marine reserve concept is different as it looks at protecting and conserving whole ecosystems rather than just the currently desired fishing resource.	None	None		Yes
Coastal environmental protection & improvement. Legacy for our children. Protects a safe haven for wide range habitats and species. All estuary should be excluded with restrictions which will permit customary cultural & sustenance harvesting - perhaps during restricted periods only. Exclude a small area of coastal waters for fishing from small boats. If local demands are even part-way met then there will be ongoing local support for reserve.	All	Areas 1, 2, 4 & part of 3.	Areas 5, 6, 7 & 8 & part of 3.	Yes
It will put too much pressure on rest of coast & will deny us the right to fish where we have done so for generations. DOC should hold discussions with commercial fishing sector about the Quota Management System & closed seasons on crayfish & especially snapper fisheries. If DOC approached the locals differently regarding the proposal, the response may be more in favour. The community need to have 'ownership' together with DOC of any such proposals.				Yes
Reserve serves no purpose, if marine stocks are being depleted then reduce catch numbers (commercial, recreational and traditional). A marine reserve will put more pressure on other areas. If it is a political move then it must be backed up by scientific evidence, not just weak & inadequate policy e.g. why must 10% be locked up as reserves? What are the objectives - I have not seen them clearly stated? I suspect the government is pandering to the Green Party policy. If fish stocks are the issue then let's address that with quota management. I would be in favour of no commercial take around the entire coastline & islands for 4 nautical miles. No reason or evidence provided. No benefit. I do not believe recreational fishing will have any significant impact & locking up a corner of GBI is a waste of time & could not be adequately policed.	All	All		Option 4 & Email
Strongly support principle. Not interested in personal benefit but support long term goal of 10% protection. Views of tangata whenua should be respected & I trust that their strong conservation traditions will lead them to support the creation of the reserve. The proposed size is one of the strongest points as it minimises edge effects & maximises ecological diversity within the reserve. The large size minimises policing efforts compared with a number of small reserves. A natural environment from hilltop to ocean floor makes this site exceptional.	None	None		Letter

763	Undated	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is	Ngati Rehua - Ngati Wai	Y	Y						O	1	1								N	OO
764	Undated	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O	1	1	1		1	1				N	OO
765	30.06.03		Wellington	NZ Rock Lobster Industry Council (Executive Officer & Research Programme Manager)								Not given										N	OO
766	1.07.03		Coromandel 2851	Forest & Bird - Upper Coromandel Branch (Chairman)				Y				OC										Y	S
767	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O	1				1	1				N	OO
768	Undated		not given					Y				OC	1		1	1						N	OO
769	30.06.03		St Amand 7150					Y				OC			1		1	1		1		Y	S
770	30.06.03		Auckland	Heilink (Commercial manager)					Y			OC								1		N	OO
771	22.08.03		Tauranga				Y					O			1		1	1				N	OO

Customary rights - we have always fished in these waters. A marine reserve isn't the only answer - fishing restrictions will help but not having any fishing will not breed fish. All the estuary is important to the people for food, fish & shellfish. This is an exposed coastline where we can only fish weather permitting - it is a natural reserve. The amount of reserves in place and proposed within and bordering the Ngatiwai coastline is nothing short of greedy, especially when consultation in planning and choosing sites has not taken place with iwi prior to proposals.	All			Yes
Marine reserve don't work. The area is already protected by existing fishing regulations. Fish are not going to breed in area just because it is called a reserve. All estuary should be excluded. Coastline is already protected as weather only permits fishing on a few days. There has not been any consultation with residents of Aotea over this proposal. I would like DOC to justify why a marine reserve is necessary. What studies have been done in the Navy area which has been closed to fishing? Have you even bothered to do a comparative study? The proposed area is too large - it takes 30% of GBI coast & will make it harder for me to make a living as a commercial fisher. GBI residents rely on sustenance fishing & will face hardship if they cannot continue to do this. A marine reserve will do nothing to preserve fish stocks or habitat - existing fishing regulations would be more effective.	All	All		Yes & letter
Council does not support proposal. Marine Reserves Act requires reserves be established for scientific study & DOC has yet to establish that the proposed area is so unique or typical that protection is needed. DOC is determining proposed site with an analysis of "least possible opposition". The rock lobster industry will evaluate whether a marine reserve unduly interfere with commercial fishing when an application is made. We do not support DOC's approach in which it has distributed a questionnaire & has not yet decided on a marine reserve boundary as this means the opinions of individuals help shape a reserve. It is not just local residents & fishers would be affected by a marine reserve. DOC proposal brochure is deliberately misleading. There are no studies on any NZ marine reserves that support the claims of tourism benefits, with the exception of Leigh. The size of the proposal is an issue. We recommend DOC evaluate their proposal in the context of the Marine Reserves Act. We will lodge an objection to any application that does not comply with the Act.				Letter
Our branch has made visits to the island, but cannot claim to be frequent visitors. Marine reserves are essential to protect the wonderful underwater world, of which many are so unaware.				Letter
We will lose our customary rights.	All			Yes
Reasons for a reserve here are flawed. Other mechanisms to control fish stocks are better. This is a wonderful inaccessible place to fish. Where is your evidence? Regarding the estuary, set an area for gathering & manage to a local quota. There has been a lack of consultation with users by DOC. DOC is severely limiting the area my family can recreationally fish in. What area will be left for New Zealanders - the bulk of which live in Auckland.	Part	All		Yes
Benefits include snorkeling & just knowing there is a protected no-take area adjacent to a very special island. I support marine reserves as places where species will be protected for future generations from the current emphasis on resource use. Representative areas are just as important as those of scientific value.				Yes
Fly clients to various areas on GBI for 4-5 hours rock fishing. I don't think area should be closed to rock/recreational fishermen. Maybe commercial fishermen should be encouraged to use other areas until the fish population can sustain large catches.				Yes
I consider the area grossly excessive, particularly as it is on the lee side from the prevailing weather. It is far too important a recreational area to be locked up. A much smaller area may benefit but not the current proposal. Most New Zealanders are conservation minded but totally reject the belief that locking up vast areas of coast is in the best interests of the country. It is a politically motivated agenda of green extremists.				Yes

772	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is			Y					O	1		1					1				Y	QS
773	30.07.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					Not given												Y	QS
774	22.08.03		Whitianga				Y				O			1	1	1	1						N	OO
775	Undated	Titirangi	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1		1					1	Y	S
776	Undated	Hillsborough	Auckland				Y				OC			1		1	1						Y	QS
777	Undated	Kaero	Northland				Y				OC						1				1	Y	S	
778	30.06.03	Glendowie	Auckland				Y				OC			1									N	OO
779	Undated	Dannemora	Howick 1705				Y				O			1	1	1	1						N	OO
780	Undated	Dairy Flat	RD4 Albany				Y				OC			1	1								N	OO
781	Undated	Ellerslie	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1						N	OO
782	Undated	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC	1					1	1					Y	S
783	Undated	RD 5	Christchurch				Y				OC				1	1	1						Y	S
784	Undated	Island Bay	Wellington				Y				OC						1	1					Y	S
785	Undated		Rotorua				Y				OC						1						Y	S
786	Undated	Kamo	Whangarei				Y				OC					1	1		1				Y	S
787	Undated	Kamo	Whangarei				Y				OC						1						Y	S
788	Undated	Island Bay	Wellington				Y				OC			1	1	1							Y	S

Benefits include conservation of marine flora/fauna, which will enhance aesthetics of zone. Reserve will attract more visitors and contribute to local economy. DOC should encourage & assist iwi with a taiapure in estuary area & shallow waters in area 2. This will allow for customary use for iwi & adjacent residents. The southern boundary should shift to Whakatautuna Point. As a gesture of support to the local economy, DOC should tithe a percentage of concession income resulting from reserve to GBI community/education trust. Also if any direct employment ensues from management & administration of the reserve, DOC should favour suitably qualified local persons.	Part as taiapure	Area 2 as taiapure.	Areas 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, & 8.	Yes & letter
Support the concept of the reserve but the following points need to be considered before final decision: 1. The shellfish beds in estuary are subject to customary usage & controlled usage should be allowed. 2. Control of usage of shellfish beds should be vested with local body e.g. Ngati Rehua. 3. That such a governing body be allowed to input into management of fishery usage in other parts of GBI waters at a later date. 4. Facility be created for development of tourism and educational facilities at Harotaonga. Such development would enhance local employment & economy & any economic benefits could be used to fund the protection and enhancement of the reserve and perhaps future reserves around GBI.	Part			Yes
At this point, the advantage of a marine reserve has not been proven.				Yes
The maintenance of any part of the marine ecosystem is important.	None			Yes
I don't agree with the total proposed area. Rakitu Island should be a reserve including 200 metres out from shoreline. The mouth of the estuary should also be included.	Part	Areas 3, 4, 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 2 & 5.	Yes
Knowing that an area of high marine biodiversity is properly protected. The area would be an excellent addition to NZ's network of fully protected marine reserves.	None	None		Yes
Proposed area is too big. All should be able to enjoy area in their chosen way. I support better overall management of fisheries so that all can enjoy - this may include some further gathering restrictions in the greater GBI area. I am concerned about the way marine reserves are being implemented in NZ. I have heard stories about signatures gathered at Tiri, extensions granted where numbers are insufficient etc. The whole of NZ needs to be made more aware of implications and issues before any more marine reserves are approved.		None		Yes
I have been fishing off the rocks and collected pipis from estuary with all my relatives in the area for 33 years and don't want to stop now. What about the livelihoods of the families that live in Okiwi. Why should they lose a food source after generations of property ownership.	All	All		Yes
All of the Barrier should be available to recreational fishers.	All	All		Yes
I won't benefit.				Yes
Increased fish stock, biodiversity, ecotourism, educational and research into the effectiveness of marine reserves.	None	None		Yes
Protection of biodiversity and restoration of Great Barrier's ecosystem. I support using 'area of interest' as boundary for marine reserve.				Yes
Establishment of a network of marine reserves, restoration & protection of marine biodiversity. Support large area indicated for benefit & protection of fuller ecosystems & pelagic species.				Yes
None provided.				Yes
Establishment of effective marine reserve network is essential to restore and sustain marine ecosystem. The size of proposed reserve will be beneficial. The proposal area is currently suffering from decline of exploited species & will also be suffering from many other related ecological impacts of over-fishing. Fishing pressure is also increasing. I support 'area of interest' as the marine reserve boundary but am happy for local residents to sort out best possible situation in estuary - but conflict should not delay the establishment of this reserve.		None		Yes
Increased fish numbers for diving. Knowledge that marine biodiversity will be protected for generations to come.				Yes
Protection of biodiversity values, establishment of a network of marine reserves in New Zealand. I support 'area of interest' for marine reserve boundary.				Yes

789	Undated	Island Bay	Wellington						Y	N					1	1	1	1		1	Y	S
790	Undated	Point Chevalier	Auckland 1002	Outboard Boating Club of Auckland (member)			Y			OC			1			1				1	N	OO
791	Undated		Whangamata				Y			OC			1	1							N	OO
792	Undated	RD 5	Warkworth				Y			OC			1	1	1	1					N	OO
793	Undated		Urenui			Y				O	1		1	1	1	1					N	OO
794	Undated		Warkworth			Y				O	1		1	1	1	1					N	OO
795	Undated	Mt Eden	Auckland				Y			OC				1							Y	QO
796	Undated	Warkworth	Warkworth				Y			OC				1	1	1					Y	S
797	Undated	Greenlane	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1							Not given	QS
798	Undated	RD 2 Drury	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1	1	1					N	OO
799	Undated	RD 2 Drury	Auckland				Y			O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
800	Undated	Glendowie	Auckland				Y			OC			1			1					N	OO
801	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				OC			1			1	1	1			Y	QS

Benefits include my own & my family's use of GBI marine environment. As part of a nationwide network of marine reserves it will protect marine biodiversity and enhance fishing stocks. I fully support a marine reserve in this area, as well as in other areas of the NZ coastline. I think NZ should aim to have 10% of its coastlines in marine reserve by 2008.				Yes
Leave the Barrier along - New Zealanders want some freedom in their own country. If you want to conserve fish, get into these competitions. NZ belongs to New Zealanders, not to DOC. I can see no particular reason why you want to claim this area at all for not too many boats and fishermen would go into that area and certainly the weather would not permit it.	All	All		Yes
Area is safe for fishing when weather permits. Proposal has no benefit whatsoever. We absolutely oppose a marine reserve in this area.				Yes
Not necessary. Like to take kids locally fishing and diving. If reserves are everywhere we will have to travel to exercise customary rights. Area is not readily accessible, what's the point of a reserve? Let locals have the right to fish.		All		Yes
We don't need any more marine reserves. We want to be able to fish and dive this area. I don't think there will be any benefit from a marine reserve.				Yes
It has not been proven that marine reserves are necessary to protect marine biodiversity. We don't need to lock up large areas of coastline. Fish stocks under quota management are healthier now than 20 years ago. We will not benefit, we will be disadvantaged. Our customary right to fish enjoyed by myself, my father & grandfather will be taken (stolen) from us & future generations. A reserve would put fishing pressure on other areas, resulting in over fishing in these areas. We are concerned for our ability to move & anchor legally within the reserve area. Also concerned about having fish, fishing gear, live bait etc on board. You are effectively denying us access to the main safe anchorages on the east coast of GBI.	All	All		Yes & letter
I have serious concerns about how marine reserves are being planned. No benefit. The area is too large and should not extend to the 12 mile limit.				Yes
Would be a start on slowing down the environmental degradation and human impact, giving the marine ecosystems and sea life a chance to regenerate and exist as they should. It can only be a good thing to build up fish stocks & allow mature sea life & systems to live undisturbed. Proposed area is well thought out. The more reserves the better, for all the reasons outlined in your brochure.		None		Yes
Will support it only if it meets the criteria for a reserve. Not if its sole use is to alter fish stocks. A marine park is perhaps a better option. Marine reserves are for specific reasons & if these factors are not present then no benefit would be achieved. If a marine reserve is established it should apply to all area including the estuary & all to all New Zealanders.	One rule for all			Yes
Bad idea. Area is relatively remote so why not ban commercial fishermen & let the area naturally restore itself. I would not benefit, you would restrict my right to fish & dive.	All	All		Yes
The area is reasonably remote & not easily accessible for general public use (which is what a reserve is set up for). Why not ban commercial fishermen from this area? No benefit to me at all. Commercial fishing should only take place outside 12 nautical mile limit. This should be policed properly & it would enable the fish to replenish & become bountiful again.	All	All		Yes
I don't feel it is required as it is out of reach for most people to access. We have enough good marine reserves already. I don't think we will benefit as we already have other marine reserves on the east coast from Poor Knights to Whitianga. Nowhere has DOC give solid reasons for this reserve. The area is not being raped and pillaged.				Yes
Would be nice not to need to have them however the whole of NZ should be treated as one. Tighten fishing rules.				Yes

802	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O	1		1	1	1	1										N	OO
803	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O			1		1	1										N	QO
804	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						OC			1	1												N	QS
805	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						OC			1	1												Y	QS
806	Undated	Point Chevalier	Auckland					Y				OC			1				1								Y	QS	
807	Undated	Point Chevalier	Auckland				Y					OC			1		1	1										Y	QS
808	Undated	Herne Bay	Auckland				Y					OC							1								Y	S	
809	Undated	Massey	Auckland						Y			OC			1													Y	S
810	Undated	Johnsonville	Wellington						Y			N													1		N	OO	
811	Undated		Whitianga 2856				Y					O			1	1	1	1							1		N	OO	
812	Undated	RD 1 Henderson	Auckland				Y					OC			1	1	1	1										N	OO
813	Undated	Red Beach	Whangaparaoa			Y						O			1	1	1	1										N	OO

Resident of the north east coast. Do not support proposal because once the new Marine Reserves Act passes through Parliament the Minister can alter the boundaries of a marine reserve overnight without having to consult anyone so even if a smaller marine reserve goes ahead, it will soon become a very large one. I cannot believe the greed of DOC to want to take such a large area. They are obviously out to destroy local peoples' livelihood. A reserve will take away me & my family's right to go fishing & gather shellfish. My wife runs an accommodation business which will be greatly affected. People, especially those who cannot get out to sea, rely on the estuary as an area to sustainance fish. My family has lived on the north east coast for generations & we will be most affected. I hope DOC realise that for consevation to be successful, it has to have local support. DOC should look at the real reasons why stocks have decreased such as commercial fishing pressure, toxic algal blooms, sedimentation etc rather than blindly stepping in and shutting the area off totally.	All	All		Yes & letter
Because boundaries, rules & regulations can be changed in the future without consultation with the public once the new Marine Reserves Act is passed. We will not benefit as our rights to fish will be taken away. I run an accommodation business where mainlanders come to relax & catch a fish. The estuary is important for sustenance fishing, not everyone owns a boat. Locals only take enough for a feed. DOC should look at real reasons why stocks have decreased e.g. commercial fishing pressure, toxic algal blooms, sedimentation etc. The area is basically a marine reserve as it is controlled a lot by the weather.	All	All		Yes
Do not support proposal in this form. How about a different approach? There are few commercial fishing operations on GBI apart from a 2 or 3 cray fishers. Give these people special rights & phase out all commercial fishing within 5 miles of the island. Then use Mayor Island model & have several smaller total exclusion zones around whole island, ban all long lines & nets, reduce daily catch limits, license & control all charter operators. This can all be done under the Fisheries Act. This model would probably get a lot of local support & won't put fishing pressure on areas outside a no-take zone & would allow fish stocks to recover island-wide.				Yes & letter
Yes, but not a total lock-out of an area this size. How about a different approach? There are few commercial fishing operations on GBI apart from a 2 or 3 cray fishers. Give these people special rights & phase out all commercial fishing within 5 miles of the island. Then use Mayor Island model & have several smaller total exclusion zones around whole island, ban all long lines & nets, reduce daily catch limits, license & control all charter operators. This can all be done under the Fisheries Act. This model would probably get a lot of local support & won't put fishing pressure on areas outside a no-take zone & would allow fish stocks to recover island-wide.	All	All		Yes & letter
Increase in sea life in this area spilling out to other areas makes for more interesting snorkeling. Some harvesting of seafood should be allowed in estuary.	Part			Yes
Great snorkeling area for me and family. Because it is such a very large area, some areas should be excluded inside reserve to allow people can harvest seafood for themselves.	Part	Part of area 4.		Yes
Improvement of the natural environment & protection of local species.	None	None		Yes
Breeding of fish. Keep long line and commercial well away from it.				Yes
There are other ways to protect flora and fauna without disenfranchising the owners (the NZ public). There is no benefit for recreational fishers. Marine reserves are restrictive to 90% of users so have no place in our coastal waters. I have read your booklet & find nothing in its contents which suggests area meets criteria for establishing a marine reserve so I am against your proposal for a marine reserve application.	All	All		Yes
Area is impossible to police. There is no need for a reserve as there is insufficient pressure on it now. I do not agree with locking up the coastline. It is nowhere near a significant population base. I won't benefit. I totally oppose you grabbing coastline & excluding the majority of responsible users from any area.	All	All		Yes
It is not necessary, so long as regulations are kept to there will be enough for future generations. Locals especially should have the right to gather food.				Yes
Totally unnecessary - sufficient reserves around Auckland coastal areas. No benefits at all. Snapper and crayfish stocks have increased over the past 10 years. Quota management is effective. An area around Little Barrier Island would be far more acceptable & easier to police. Also Kaikoura Island.	All	All	Little Barrier Island, Kaikoura Island.	Yes

814	Undated	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O	1		1	1					Y	QS	
815	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y					OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	QO
816	Undated	Pakuranga	Auckland	Eastern Suburbs Art Group				Y				OC			1	1		1	1		1	Y	S
817	Undated	RD 5	Matakana				Y					O			1	1	1	1				N	QO
818	Undated	RD 5	Warkworth				Y					O			1	1	1	1				N	QO
819	Undated	RD 5	Warkworth				Y					O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
820	Undated	RD 5	Warkworth				Y					O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
821	Undated	Harataonga	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O	1		1	1	1	1				Y	QS
822	Undated	Okupu	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
823	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O	1		1		1					Y	QS
824	Undated	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O	1		1	1	1	1				Y/N	QS

In relation to estuary, I would be happy to see concessions made if necessary with iwi to secure some sort of marine reserve. Would like to see southern boundary moved north to Whakatautuna Point. Have lived at Harataonga with my family since 1989 & have serious concerns about DOC's ability to police such a large reserve - local volunteer policing of reserve is not realistic. Fishing in this area is policed by weather. Concerned about commercial fishing in area & illegal fishing (taking too many or undersize fish & shellfish) by visitors in summer. Concerned about access to the reserve being across Harataonga Beach, which is a pristine area. The economic benefits to the island remain to be seen. In a sense, it will depend on what GBI residents make of it. Concerned that once a reserve is created it can be expanded without consultation. In summary, I do support principle of a marine reserve.	Part for iwi			Yes
Weather conditions dictate which side of the island you can shelter and fish on. Distance from mainland restricts number of visitors. I believe there is a big safety issue here. I will not benefit. Concerned that once a reserve is created it can be expanded without consultation. Protect area from commercial fishing but leave whole area open to recreational fishing.	All			Yes
I am in favour of conservation and preservation of the seascape. Proposal also signed by Norma Fitzgerald, Jennifer Perger, Valerie Holbrook, Olga Wilmering.	None	None		Yes
I am a regular visitor to area on family launch. I agree there is a need for a reserve of some form on east coast of GBI as it would help to replenish numbers of marine species for future generations. Concerned that you won't be able to anchor in area with fish caught outside the reserve. Concerned about sheltered anchorages. There is so much hassle trying to stick to reserve rules. This means people will stay on west coast & put pressure on that area. Should include the navy testing area. Should exclude commercial but allow a level of recreational fishing.		Sheltered anchorages in areas 3, 4 & 5.		Yes & letter
Too big. The area regulates itself because of its geographic isolation and weather conditions. Pleasure fishing in this area has a low impact on most fish and habitats. Concerned about the fishing pressure the reserve would put on other waters around Great Barrier.	All	Sheltered areas.		Yes
It will not be the same, I like fishing there & it has the best spear fishing has ever seen. I don't think we need more marine reserves in the Hauraki Gulf because the fish stocks are fine in the existing marine reserves.	All	All		Yes
I feel our family would be totally restricted from visiting the area, which is one of our most favourite places, because we always carry fish & dive gear on our boat. We holiday there regularly & like to catch a fish.				Yes
Live at Harataonga. A marine reserve this large should have a significant impact on marine environment - an amazing gift for future generations. The spillover will improve crayfish & fish stocks in surrounding areas. Would not mind if a concession was given to local iwi for use of estuary if that is what is required to gain their support for proposal. Concerned about impacts to Harataonga if visitors are not managed. Many negatives about proposal to me including losing my favourite fishing spots. The area is lightly used by fishers. I am concerned about DOC's ability to police the reserve and manage the land based impacts of the reserve. Concerned about the boundary being extended without consultation. Could be more pressure on areas outside the reserve. However, the positives outweigh the negatives & I support proposal if: (a) the southern boundary is moved to Whakatautuna Point & (b) DOC treats Harataonga as part of the reserve, with no modification allowed (except repositioning of toilet).	Part for iwi	Move southern boundary to Whakatautuna Point.		Yes
I would like to answer the question of support differently but do not trust DOC's interpretation of my answer.	All	All		Yes
Proposal is too big. Exclude the estuary for shellfish gathering & manage locally.. Exclude area out to 1km off the coast to allow for recreational fishing. Ministry of Fisheries need to address over fishing on GBI.	All	Coastal areas 1, 2, 3 & 4.		Yes
Over-fishing by having to high a quota on catch will always deplete an area - change this problem. I will not benefit from this proposal unless customary rights are part of proposal as I live in the middle of the proposed area. Proposal should exclude the Okwi area - a taiapure & wildlife sanctuary in this area would be more appropriate. All private land should not be included. A marine reserve in Harataonga area would be supported. It should have Whakatautuna Point as the southern boundary, include Rakitu Island. This would allow for sheltered diving & great marine diversity & would include a camping ground & boat access.	All	Areas 2 & 3.	Areas 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes

825	Undated	Point Wells	Warkworth				Y			OC			1	1						N	QO
826	Undated		Whakatane				Y			O			1	1	1					N	OO
827	Undated		Whakatane				Y			O			1	1						N	OO
828	Undated		Opotiki				Y			OC			1							N	OO
829	Undated	Hicks Bay	East Coast	Houkamau			Y			O	1		1		1					N	OO
830	Undated		Rotorua	Te Arawa			Y			O			1		1					N	OO
831	Undated		Rotorua				Y			O			1							N	OO
832	Undated	Swanson	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
833	Undated		Rotorua				Y			O			1	1	1					N	OO
834	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				OC			1	1	1	1				Y	QS
835	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y					OC			1	1	1	1	1			Y	S
836	1.07.03	Mission Bay	Auckland	Outboard Boating Club of Auckland (member)			Y			O			1	1	1	1				N	QO
837	Undated	Birkdale	Auckland				Y			O			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
838	Undated	Glendowie	Auckland				Y			OC			1			1				N	OO
839	Undated	Epsom	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1	1					N	QO
840	Undated	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				O										N	OO
841	Undated		Orewa 1461	Outboard Boating Club & Gulf Harbour Fishing Club (member)			Y			O			1	1		1				N	OO
842	Undated	Tawa	Wellington						Y	N										N	OO
843	Undated	Piha	Auckland				Y			OC			1			1				N	OO

In certain weather conditions this is can be the most sheltered position and place to fish particularly for smaller boats. No benefit at all, would just be another invasion of our enjoyment & pleasure. Would not be opposed to reserve towards the south-east end which is the least accessible to boaties wanting to shelter. Could also include the current no anchor, no fishing zone. The proposed area is not overly raped or pillaged.	All	All	Navy zone & southern part of area 4.	Yes
Cannot see justification of the proposed location for a marine reserve. It would rob me of enjoying my present activities. Concerned about the lack of consultation and the timeframe is hasty.				Yes
It is not needed.				Yes
Research needs to be done.				Yes
I won't benefit.				Yes
Where would we fish?				Yes
Don't need it.				Yes
Need to provide scientific proof that a marine reserve is necessary or even will work. This reserve seems much to prohibitive for local kiwi.				Yes
There is no real reason to have a marine reserve.				Yes
Reserve will enhance environment & continue protection for now & into the future. This is very important for GBI residents & visitors. Whangapoua should be included but I have concerns about some people not being able to take shellfish. The area is too big & will be difficult to police. It should go to the other side of Harotaonga so people can fish from there to Navy area. The concept has a lot of support on GBI but DOC has got people offside. Please consider modifying proposal as a smaller area is better than nothing.		Areas 6 & 8 & part of 5.	Areas 2, 3, 4, 7 & part of 5.	Yes
It will help our marine life & stop over-fishing on our coastline. It could in future create job opportunities which will benefit people in GBI.				Yes
Do not support proposal because of the attendant restrictions of the Marine Reserves Act: no right of passage guaranteed with fish caught outside, possibility of fees to be charged for concessions, anchorage rights may be prescribed. Very hard to see any benefits when reserves are for scientific study only. Iwi will need to have access to their customary fishing areas. While I reject the proposal at this stage I am sympathetic to the formation of marine reserves subject to the continuation of reasonable rights of usage within the reserve by members of the public. My concerns with this proposal are: 1) access & enjoyment by the public free of charge, 2) safe navigation of ships at sea, 3) continuation of normal rights of anchorage, & 4) that all recreational & private recreational commercial vessels are not required to acquire a concession or pay fees. I look forward to the development of an amended proposal.	All for iwi use	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 a marine park.	Areas 6 & 8.	Yes
Want to be able to take his children/grandchildren fishing. The area is only used in good weather. It would be better to cut commercial fishing quotas. Fish are a transient species & there is no evidence that this area is a fish nursery hence protecting fish stock. If we are protecting fish stocks for the future then we should reduce commercial fishing quotas as these are reducing fish numbers for New Zealanders.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7.		Yes
The area is too big and part of the wider Hauraki Gulf which is used by Aucklanders and visitors for recreational fishing. The Hauraki Gulf should be recreational fishing only with fish limits and fishing clubs encouraging catch and release. Over the past thirty years it is my experience that commercial fishing has reduced significantly fish stocks e.g.. kawhai, king fish.				Yes
The area is naturally protected from over fishing due to its remote location. A simple plan for the future would be to ban commercial fishing. I appreciate the objectives of this proposal & if reserve was proposed for the accessible north-east coast I would support it.		All	Accessible parts of north east coast of GBI.	Yes
I am against this proposal.				Yes
We have enough reserves and fishing is monitored and restricted when necessary.				Yes
I believe enforced quotas are preferable to marine reserves. DOC does some good things but I am not convinced marine reserves are the answer - we need a list of information that convinces us of that.	All	All		Option 4
I believe that the current regulation covers the situation without further red tape. Apart from keeping out commercial activities, I can see no reason for the reserve at all. I don't like the way DOC are pursuing this legislation without proper consultation.				Yes

844	Undated	Mt Albert	Auckland				Y			OC				1	1				Y	S
845	Undated	RD 4	Whangarei				Y			O			1	1	1	1			Y	QS
846	Undated		not given				Y			O					1				Y	S
847	Undated	Bucklands Beach	Auckland				Y			OC			1						Y	S
848	Undated	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				O			1	1	1	1			Y	S
849	Undated	Howick	Auckland	Auckland Outboard Boating Club (member)			Y			OC	1		1		1				N	OO
850	Undated		Auckland 1007	Auckland Sport Fishing Club (patron)			Y			OC			1		1				N	OO
851	Undated		Auckland			Y				O			1	1	1	1			Y	QS
852	Undated	Claris Mail Centre	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				O			1	1	1	1			N	OO
853	Undated	Claris	Great Barrier Is			Y				O			1			1			N	OO
854	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y					O					1			1	N	OO
855	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is	Okiwi School (student)	Y					O			1		1	1		1	Y	QS
856	Undated		Great Barrier Is	Ngatiwai	Y					O	1		1		1	1			N	QO
857	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y					O			1	1	1	1			N	QO
858	Undated		Great Barrier Is	Ngatiwai	Y					O	1		1	1		1	1		Y	QS
859	Undated		Great Barrier Is	Okiwi School (student)	Y					OC					1				Y	QS
860	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				OC			1	1	1	1			Y	QS
861	Undated	Bayswater	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1					N	OO

Gives us a great place to dive close to Auckland and an alternative to the Poor Knights. Exclude small area for spear fishing. It is great to see large deep water areas and inter-tidal areas being protected, not just the coastal parts. I want to be able to see fully functioning pieces of ocean.		Northern end of area 3.		Yes
Do not sport proposal being this large. Area south of Rakitu Island would be better as reserve as there are few sheltered anchorages in this area.		Area 3.	Areas 4 & 5.	Yes
I may not benefit immediately but the generations to come shall be thanking our initiative - it will create mana within the people knowing our shores & surrounding waters are safe. Locals should have their say heard but should weigh the benefits of coastal harvesting - my view is that to do the job right a total ban on taking of all kaimoana needs to be in place. The proposed area will benefit all marine species. Need to realise these reserves are necessary for the same reason Aotearoa is known for.		None		Yes
Will help the ecosystem hold on against pressure of over use.				Yes
Live very near southern boundary of proposed reserve. I support the proposal but it would have a large impact on my life. The bay I live in is very remote & quiet & if boundary finished halfway along it as proposed there would be a lot of pressure on other half. This would increase the number of people in area, & consequently the noise, visual pollution etc. I would strongly prefer southern boundary moved south to take in the whole bay & Red Bluff would be the landmark for boundary. I am concerned about losing my privacy. If estuary is in good condition, leave it out of proposal.			Move southern boundary south to bluff at north end of Awana Bay.	Yes
Ban commercial fishing absolutely to the 12 mile limit, leave the island seabed and foreshore as it is.				Yes
The area is not over fished and provides access for folk from the city to fish without traveling too far.				Yes
If the reserve was more limited in scope I think it would adequately provide for the conservation of the resource for the future. Reserve should stop at northern end of Whangapoua Beach so that the estuary & Arid Island are not included.	All	Areas 2, 4 & 5.	Areas 3, 6 & 7.	Yes
Have lived here for 3 generations & do not want reserve.				Yes
I am the fourth generation in this area.				Yes
I like fish and pipis for my dinner. A marine reserve will mean for fish in the sea.	All			Yes
I will benefit by being able to dive in the estuary & see lots of fish. Some of the pipi and cockle beds in estuary should be able to be harvested. I have highlighted where I think there should be a marine reserve.	Part	Areas 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Area 4.	Yes
It is too big and there are too many marine reserves. Benefits might be more jobs & people because it will attract people. The estuary & Rakitu Island should not be marine reserves - I have drawn my boundaries on the map.	All	Areas 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Area 4.	Yes
It is the only pipi place on Great Barrier Island. If there is a marine reserve I can go diving & see lots of fish. Harotaonga & Korotiti Bay would be a good place for a marine reserve.	All	Areas 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Part of Area 4 plus Korotiti Bay.	Yes
Benefits are more fish, more employment & more education. Should exclude part of the Whangapoua estuary for pipi and cockle harvesting because I have been eating these all my life. I support the idea if the reserve was smaller.	Part	Areas 2, 3, 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 4 & 5.	Yes
It would make me happy because the fish are not being eaten. I don't think the estuary should be excluded. The DOC proposal is too big so I changed the boundaries.	None	Areas 3, 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 2, 4 & 5.	Yes
Have lived at Port Fitzroy for 8 years, running a small dive bottle refilling station there. I have noticed a change in attitude with a lot more divers asking for scenic diving & less asking where the big crays are hiding. Along with many residents, I would like to retain my right to collect shellfish from the estuary & launch & fish locally from a small boat. I propose the estuary & sea adjacent to private land be excluded & managed locally by a taiapure.	All as a taiapure	Areas 2 & part of 4 out to Rakitu Island as taiapure.		Yes
There are other ways to help the environment than stopping fishing. A marine reserve is not the way to protect the environment, dropping quotas, educating people, managing the area and working with the community is a start. Closing it off to all harvesting is wrong. I use areas 3, 5 & 6 for fishing.	All	All		Yes

862	Undated		Whangarei	Whangarei Deep Sea Anglers Club			Y				O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
863	Undated	RD 1 Onecahi	Whangarei				Y				OC			1	1	1	1					Y	S
864	Undated	Whangaparaoa	Auckland			Y	Y				OC			1	1	1						N	OO
865	Undated		Whitianga				Y		Y		OC						1	1				Y	S
866	Undated	RD 2	Wellsford				Y				OC			1	1	1	1	1				N	OO
867	Undated	RD 2	Wellsford				Y				O			1	1	1	1	1				N	OO
868	Undated	Kohimarama	Auckland			Y					OC			1	1	1	1					Y	QS
869	Undated	Bay View	Napier				Y				O			1								N	OO
870	Undated	Whangaparaoa	Auckland	Stanmore Bay Boating Club (Sponsor)			Y				OC			1	1							N	OO
871	Undated	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					OC			1		1	1	1				Y	QS
872	Undated	East Tamaki	Auckland				Y				OC							1				Y	S
873	Undated	Point Chevalier	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1					N	OO
874	Undated	West Harbour	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1		1					N	QO
875	Undated	Medlands	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O			1			1	1		1		N	OO
876	Undated	Algies Bay	Warkworth				Y				OC			1	1	1						N	QO
877	Undated	RD 1 Whangaparapara	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O			1	1		1					N	OO
878	Undated	Whangaparapara	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y					O			1		1	1					N	OO

Our members regularly visit the north east coast of GBI to fish & dive . We do not support the ad hoc approach to marine reserve establishment. We want to see a planned process so we can fully consider all the implications. The proposal document is misleading and contains contradictory items & factual errors.	All	All		Yes
Improved fish stocks and leaves unspoiled areas for my children's' children. NZ could benefit from eco-tourism. Marine reserves work well with land reserves. We need to find a balance of production and protection and this is an excellent example.				Yes
Because of weather conditions. The coastline is remote and hard to visit. Ban commercial fishing to preserve fish life. If you want to improve fish numbers, ban taking of fish in the months they are spawning - commercial and recreational.				Option 4
I will personally not benefit apart from knowing that future generations will be able to see & enjoy the under-sea world. Please protect our oceans - we need to replenish not diminish. The more reserves throughout the world the better. NZ can make a good contribution and example.				Yes
Danger to people with not enough experience having to fish further out. Sharks taking over, ruining reefs, spiky dogs. Already have a quota system which protects over fishing of all New Zealand. We should be able to catch our own food source.				Yes
We commercially fish over there & have for 7 years for crayfish. We believe there will be a shark problem, carpet shark and spiky dog which will ruin reefs and wildlife. Also people will be forced to fish in more dangerous areas. Amateur fishers do not always have experience - will be more fatal boat accidents.				Yes
Need some take zones. There needs to be a more holistic approach to the entire Gulf and Great Barrier. The proposed reserve is too inclusive & needs to better balance recreational use & conservation. Allow some take.		Areas 2, 4 & 5 should allow some take.		Yes
Customary food gathering - the Mabey family obtain 15-20% of their food from the sea. Possibly the whole or part of the area could be protected from commercial fishing, although snapper stocks are quite good which shows the quota system is working. The local people are virtually all conservationists as they do not take more than is necessary for food purposes.	All	All		Yes
It is the most popular fishing area and sheltered area when the weather turns foul would be lost.				Yes
A reserve will enhance the natural habitat and hopefully fish stocks for future generations. Gathering shellfish in the estuary should be allowed for and appropriately managed. Could allow land fishing outside the school season in certain areas. Before designating a large area there needs to be in place a sound management system that allows for total or partial closure from time to time. Where the sea adjoins private land some provision or concession must be allowed for. Liaison between Ministry of Fisheries and DOC is needed as is cooperation with the local community.	Part	Coastal areas allowed to be used seasonally.		Yes & letter
All will benefit from a marine reserve. The more reserves the better.				Yes
Should only restrict commercial fishing.				Yes
The area is too large. There is interference with utilisation for a large majority of visitors and residents. Small areas such as Goat Island dotted at intervals around the coast would provide a more practical or less intrusive aid to preserving fish stocks plus a better control of commercial trawling.		All		Yes
Residents should have the right to fish for their food. Stop all commercial fishing in the area and allow recreational as it has a very low impact on environment.	Part	Areas 2, 4 & 5.		Yes
If you must have a reserve then all of Whangapoua estuary & Arid Island should be the maximum size. Proposed area is far too big & includes anchorages suitable for overnight shelter & fishing & diving. Back of Barrier is not sheltered so is not that usable.	None	Areas 3, 4, 6, 7 & 8.	Area 2 & out to Rakitu Island.	Yes
No clear benefits. Create a proper conservation policy, not an ad-hoc, piecemeal type.				Yes
Not unless proper consultation with affected persons and Ministry of Fisheries for a total solution. If conservation is the true reasoning for marine reserve status it cannot work without changing fishing regulations over all e.g. confer with the people and Ministry of Fisheries to achieve proper conservation.	All			Yes

879	Undated	RD 1 Whangaparapara	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														O				1	1											N	OO	
880	Undated	C/o Okiwi Post Office	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														O	1			1	1	1	1	1	1								N	OO
881	Undated	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														O	1			1	1	1	1	1									N	OO
882	Undated	RD 1	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														OC	1			1	1	1											N	OO
883	Undated	RD 4	Taumarunui					Y												OC				1													N	OO
884	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y	Y														OC				1			1	1									N	OO
885	Undated	RD 8	Whangarei	Maungamanamea Landcare Group (Coordinator)				Y												OC				1								1				Y	S	
886	Undated		not given		Y															OC																Y	S	
887	Undated	Parnell	Auckland			Y	Y													O				1	1	1	1	1								Y/N	OO	
888	Undated	Point Wells	Warkworth				Y													O				1								1				N	OO	
889	Undated	Matakana	Auckland					Y												OC				1	1	1	1										N	OO

Previous support has been worn thin by DOC ignoring our wishes and DOC's inability to manage the land under their stewardship at present. No attention has been given to the infrastructure for this proposal i.e.. boat launch areas for viewing and policing boats, car park areas, roading and maintenance, policing the size alone makes it impossible, the cost. DOC and Ministry of Fisheries should sit in consultation with all affected parties on GBI and together develop a fishing policy. This can also achieve a self policing atmosphere. Allowing large trawlers to trawl up to cliff faces is destructive as is allowing fishing in the gulf during snapper spawning. The glossy brochure is unsuitable for garden or compost - is this conservation?	All			Yes
Commercial fishing & siltation are problems & a marine reserve will not solve them. When snapper spawn they will leave the reserve and will be picked in the Gulf while vulnerable. The remaining coast will still be under pressure. NZ has the best tag and release system in the world and this is excellent for scientific research. Crayfish are migratory - they will go outside the reserve. There is a worm problem in the scallop beds due to overseas vessels. There are too many pipis in the estuary that they are becoming deformed - a no-take would worsen this problem. Access to the proposed reserve is dangerous. The brochure is misleading showing the glass-bottom boat at Leigh, people are lead to believe that could happen here. Concerned about how much say the locals of the area who are directly concerned will have and how much others will have a say in my and my family's future. Concerned that the Marine Reserves Bill will allow the Minister of Conservation to amend the boundaries of the reserve without the consent of the locals. Concerned about DOC's plans for other reserves.	All	All		Yes
Commercial fishing is the main problem, there needs to be areas where commercial take is prohibited. Sustenance fishers such as GBI residents are no threat to fish stocks and other marine life. The north east coast has very little sustenance/recreational fishing due to the exposed location. DOC's approach is arrogant & anti-human. Recreational fishers use a relatively small percentage of the sea that is close into the coastline - the same areas DOC wants to close up. Will have to go either 12 miles out to sea, 6-7 miles north around the Needles or 10 miles south to get beyond the reserve and Navy zone. Concerned about where visitors to the reserve will launch. Concerned that it has been reported that most locals support the proposal.	All	All		Yes
Around Great Barrier we are extremely limited by the weather. We can't buy fish here so have to catch our own. Stop commercial fishing and respect the fish spawning season.				Yes
Fish shift around the oceans. A closed season when fish are spawning would prove more beneficial and increase the size limit for fish.				Yes
The size of the area would be too hard to police.				Yes
Anything that protects the environment and finite resources benefits me & my family. This proposal is in keeping with government commitments to protecting 10% of coastline in marine reserves.				Yes
Should lead to great numbers of fish and shellfish for everyone and protection of scarce resource.				Yes
Would prefer a marine park with no commercialisation. I am apprehensive of DOC's intention to commercialise the reserve, by promoting eco-tourism. The glossy brochure signals an agenda for developing this as a major tourist area. Too greater visitor numbers will endanger the fragile habitats. There is no accompanying archaeological report. How will DOC fund the necessary civil infrastructure to protect the amenity values of the island landscape its coast and foreshore? Increased threat of fire & of weed & pest invasion into the forest. Should ban commercial fishing at all times and recreational fishing and diving and shellfish gathering at breeding times.				Yes
As a deckie, 10-15% of trips are to this area. It is a safe haven for boats in certain winds. Should change the no-anchor, no-fishing areas into reserves as what you are doing is pushing more boats into smaller fishing areas - safety first. Also sent in form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Yes & form letter
It is a good safe haven from some winds for smaller boats and good for all activities indicated above.				Yes

890	Undated	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O			1	1	1	1				Y	QS
891	Undated	Forest Lake	Hamilton				Y					O			1		1	1				Y	QS
892	Undated	RD 5	Warkworth				Y					O			1	1	1	1	1			N	OO
893	Undated	RD 2	Warkworth					Y				OC			1		1					N	OO
894	Undated		Leigh		Y		Y					O			1			1				N	OO
895	Undated		Owhango				Y					O			1	1	1					N	OO
896	Undated		Warkworth					Y				OC			1							N	OO
897	Undated	RD 5	Warkworth				Y					O			1							N	OO
898	Undated	RD 5	Warkworth				Y					O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
899	Undated	Mathesons Bay	Auckland		Y		Y					O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
900	Undated	RD Papatoetoe	Auckland				Y		Y			OC			1	1	1	1				Y	QO
901	Undated		not given				Y					O			1	1		1				N	OO
902	Undated	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O	1		1		1	1				N	OO
903	Undated	Port Fitzroy	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y						O	1		1	1	1	1	1			Y	QS
904	Undated	Wairahi	Great Barrier Is		Y							O	1		1	1	1	1	1			N	OO
905	Undated	RD 3	Whangarei				Y		Y			OC			1	1	1	1		1		N	OO
906	Undated	Point Wells RD 6	Warkworth				Y					OC			1	1						Y	QS
907	Undated		Whakatane	Baker Marine Charters (Owner)			Y					OC			1	1	1	1				Y	QS

Support the proposal with qualifications. All seashore adjacent to private land should be excluded. No clear evidence that there are benefits so this is an experiment & should be set up as such - area should be policed & extensively studied. I fail to understand why the area needs to be so large - surely a smaller area can result in regeneration of marine life without excluding New Zealanders who wish to enjoy this special environment, which surely should be our right. Any change in the law which does not have acceptance will not work.	Part	Areas adjacent to private land.		Yes
Reserve will increase the marine life on display. Exclude all estuary & monitor shellfish take. Some recognition and provision for the customary rights of not only tangata whenua but also the non-Maori kaitiaki of Whangapoua e.g. Mabey family is needed. The current proposal area is too big. Will be a nightmare to enforce and buy in from the local community difficult to obtain.	All	Areas 3, 6 & 7.	Areas 2, 4, 5 & 8.	Yes
It is not necessary. I will not benefit. If reserve goes ahead I will regularly poach in this area. Concerned about losing anchoring rights and losing a safe haven.	All	All		Yes
There is not enough pressure to justify it, fish stocks seem fine to me.	All	All		Yes
Recognise the Navy area as a marine reserve & cable areas.	All	All		Yes
I want my traditional right to use the area and to be able to pass on the enjoyment of the natural environment to my children. If fish stocks are being depleted, reduce the total catch for the people taking most of the fish.				Yes
Am opposed to any more marine reserves in our area.				Yes
No reserve.				Yes
Not necessary.				Yes
How stupid can you be? No benefits at all, we will lose rights. Where will I take shelter now I will be breaking the law if I have fish on board?	All	All	Navy zone.	Yes
Support the reserve with limited boundaries. No justification of area chosen, should be smaller, easier to monitor and enforce. Already have Naval exclusion zone. DOC has no capability of monitoring area effectively. I only support the area marked on my map.		Areas 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 2 & 4 & including Rakitu Island.	Yes
Area is too large. DOC can't control/monitor areas they already have control of. This reserve would mean only commercial fishers would benefit because they can fish outside the area. There are safety issues as all safe anchorages are included. There has been totally inadequate leadership from DOC over this issue with no meetings organised by them on the mainland.	All	All		Yes
Do not support the size of it and how it affects me getting a feed for my family. I enjoy days with my family in the estuary, gathering & learning what to take & teaching my kids to take only what we need. Can a reserve save the damage caused by years of take, take, take? I think a benefit for all would be to go into fish farming/aquaculture.	Part			Yes
Do not support proposal in present form. Benefits will be increase in fish & underwater life which would be good for snorkeling & tourism. Estuary should not be excluded but access should be given to locals & Maori for traditional use. We should work towards exclusion so allow present generation of locals to use area & exclude in future under a taiapure system, allowing pipi & cockle collection.				Yes
Loss of freedom. I like to fish and dive up and around the Needles. There should be boat access through the estuary. Have you done any research in other areas round Barrier e.g. Navy zone? Have you thought about Little Barrier Island or Mokohinau Islands? I use areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7.				Yes
The question about supporting the reserve in principle is leading. I am a marine biologist with background in fisheries management. More flexible management options are appropriate for an area of this size e.g. mataitai in estuary. A reserve will prevent the release & recapture of tagged fish that will add to information of key recreational species in the area. Exclude areas that are not justified based on the principles of the Marine Reserves Act 1971. There is no coordinated approach - ad hoc proposals are inappropriate at this time.				Yes
Support reserve in the area already prohibiting fishing south of Whakatautuna Point. A reserve will provide an area for natural to continue without disturbance by man. Have a reserve in middle section of back of the Barrier .e.g. Kaitoke area including Navy zone as it is not necessary for shelter and therefore fishing.		Coastal areas that provide shelter for boats.	Kaitoke area & Navy zone.	Yes
A reserve will provide more and bigger fish to see. Leave the estuary open for local food gatherers & leave Arid Cove open for local landowners use. A reserve is a must for this and also a lot of other areas.	All	Arid Cove.		Yes

908	Undated	RD 2	Warkworth				Y											O			1			1									Y/N	QO	
909	Undated	Mt Roskill	Auckland				Y											OC			1												N	OO	
910	Undated	Pukekohe	Auckland		Y		Y											O			1				1								N	OO	
911	Undated	Auckland Central	Auckland Central	Outboard Boating Club of Auckland (Past commodore), RNZYS (Flagship Committee)				Y										OC				1											Y	QS	
912	Undated	Milford	Auckland				Y											OC			1	1	1	1									N	OO	
913	Undated	St Johns	Auckland				Y											OC			1												N	QO	
914	Undated	Papatoetoe	Auckland				Y		Y									OC			1	1	1	1									Y	QS	
915	Undated	Medlands Beach	Great Barrier Is			Y												O			1			1									N	OO	
916	Undated		not given	Fishing website founder (www.fishing.net.nz)				Y										OC			1			1	1									N	QO
917	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y													OC	1		1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1			N	OO	
918	Undated	Torbay	Auckland		Y		Y											O	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				N	OO	
919	Undated	Okupu	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y												O	1		1	1	1	1									Y	QS	
920	Undated	Okupu	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y												O	1		1	1	1	1									N	OO	
921	Undated	Redwood	Christchurch 8005					Y										OC			1	1											Y	QS	
922	Undated	St Heliers	Auckland					Y										OC				1			1								Y	S	
923	Undated		Auckland 1001					Y										OC				1	1	1	1	1	1	1					Y	S	
924	Undated	Waiatarua	Auckland				Y											O			1	1	1	1									N	OO	
925	Undated	Remuera	Auckland				Y											OC			1			1	1									N	OO

There should be a marine reserve but it should be smaller as the current size ridiculous. A harbour reserve is a good idea, if a marine reserve goes ahead should be one law i.e. no take for everybody.	None			Yes
Do not believe it to be fair to the residents of the island.				Yes
I don't believe recreational fishing stocks will deplete - commercial fishing should be more of a concern. If DOC is looking at a marine reserve then should choose area that entire coastline is DOC land. People want to have access to areas like the estuary so entire area should be excluded. There are already laws in place regarding the over-collection of fish & shellfish - why not try policing these if DOC think over-collection is an issue. Areas should be protected from commercial fishing not recreational fishing. Recreational fishing does not deplete stocks, 99% of users do not adversely affect area & it is high handed to take it away.	All	All		Yes
Reserve will stop large breeding snapper being taken from areas that are not normally accessible due to sea conditions. Reserve should start 2 miles north of Rakitu Island to enable visitors to that anchorage to obtain sustenance. Due to the remoteness & ruggedness of area this is an ideal spot for a marine reserve.		Areas 4 & 5.	Areas 3, 6 & 7.	Yes
I use this area for boating.		All		Yes
Do not support because it's good fishing there. There should be some controls such as no fishing during spawning season. Keep commercial fishing out & monitor recreational fishing. Fishing is our heritage & we should be allowed to do what our forefathers taught us so we can teach our kids.	All	All		Yes
Support proposal but the size and exact location need significant public input and majority support, not just 50%.				Yes
Proposed area too extensive and proposed restrictions too draconian. Area is a popular and seasonal recreational area. Benefits appear marginal but there could be an increase in marine life & area will be protected from commercial fishing. Exclude customary shellfish gathering areas but they should still be subject to limits.	Part			Yes
Do not support current proposal at all. There is not sufficient evidence for any significant benefit. Proposal needs a total rethink. I spend a considerable amount of time in Mercury Bay & support the reserve in that area as it doesn't impact significantly on reasonable recreational activity. A vastly reduced area on GBI would be acceptable.	All	All		Yes
I want to go fishing for my dinner and lunch and breakfast.				Yes
You already have large areas of reserve including Takapuna to Mokohinau's, Long Bay, Leigh. If you are serious about preserving fish stocks, stop commercial fishing in Gulf & let recreational fishers, divers alone. DOC already has a large percentage of the island under control - it has weeds so you can't look after your own let alone anything else. We cannot use the tracks & are not allowed dogs, mountain bikes or to hunt.	All	All		Yes
Some exclusions for gathering shellfish & recreational fishing.	Part	Part of area 4.		Yes
There area is already a Marine Park & should be kept open for residents and tourists				Yes
Reserve would help build up fish stocks but doesn't need to cover whole area proposed as there are areas not suitable for family boats that are suitable for reserves. As a boating family would not want to see the safe family fishing areas made into reserve.				Yes
Preservation of amenity & a gradual improvement over time.				Yes
Reserve will protect an important mix of habitats for marine research and for no take diving, education etc. I have surveyed the area from Aiguilles Island to Whakatautuna and was very impressed by the mix of underwater habitats. Some of these habitats have not until now really been a feature of marine reserves in NZ.	None			Yes
To keep up fish stocks, keep commercial out. Recreational fishers already have a daily limit which is rarely taken. The Navy area already exists as a form of no-fishing area. Concerned about kingfish being fished commercially when amateurs prize these as game fish & the fish are generally returned unharmed.	All	All		Yes
Too large, would only provide benefit to a limited group. Should have consulted more widely before progressing to this stage.				Yes

926	Undated	Glendene	Auckland					Y											OC										1							Y	S
927	08.07.03	Papatoetoe	Auckland					Y											O				1												N	OO	
928	Undated	Meadowbank	Auckland					Y											OC				1	1											N	OO	
929	10.07.03	Glen Eden	Auckland					Y											OC				1	1					1				1		N	OO	
930	10.07.03	Takanini	Auckland					Y											OC				1												N	OO	
931	10.07.03	Okura	RD2 Albany					Y											OC				1	1	1	1					1			N	OO		
932	10.07.03	Titirangi 1007	Auckland					Y											OC				1	1					1					Y	QS		
933	9.07.03	North Shore Mail Centre	Auckland					Y											O				1	1	1										N	QO	
934	23.07.03	Bethlehem	Tauranga					Y											OC				1												N	OO	
935	03.07.03		Auckland	Auckland Regional Council (Strategic Policy Analyst)															Not given																Y	S	
936	30.07.03		Not given	The New Zealand Seafood Industry Council (Policy Manager)															O				1											Not given	Not given		
937	01.07.03	Mt Cook	Wellington					Y											OC				1			1								Y	S		

In principle I believe we must set aside reserves on both land & sea to protect a multitude of species from the worst ravages of humankind and so conserve biodiversity for posterity and for the continuation of ecosystems. It seems to me that tangata whenua & locals should have limited access to estuary for shellfish. Reserve would be a significant step in the right direction for conserving 10% of coastline.	Part			Yes
You won't be able to police area from commercial fishing and it will only be the recreational fisher that you will catch.				Yes
There is no stated risk to environment. The area's isolation from the majority of recreational fishers ensures the risk would be minimal. A reserve here would effectively eliminate sheltered anchorages & sheltered fishing.				Yes
Do not support such large reserves on principle and due to arbitrary ceiling of 10%. If reserves are so popular then try one in a popular area like Mission Bay. I would support restricted fishing by other means e.g. limits to methods of fishing. I am not convinced such a restriction is needed but do support consideration of fishing types to be allowed. This proposal will erode my personal freedom. I suggest offshore zones for specific methods of fishing rather than a reserve. I view this reserve as a test case and a beginning of a concentrated effort to constrict fishing and other related activities and as such do not support this reserve. Restrictions without widespread consultation & acceptance will create friction & distrust.	All	All		Yes & Option 4
Why do you need to take this area out of public access for fishing? Why is it necessary? You want a reserve & the Maori want the whole coastline. Leave it alone.	All	All		Yes
We have enough. Better to have higher fishing controls on whole Gulf. Creating a special zone at GBI does nothing for rampant gathering elsewhere. Why not have one at the Auckland Islands? DOC cannot manage what they have now. More to the point, when will DOC replace the hut at Whangapara? Not needed in this area. Much too big and in the wrong location. Who is to use the reserve, apart from DOC? DOC would be better to limit commercial fishing in the Hauraki Gulf, especially some methods. What is the DOC 50-year plan & how will it be funded? Where is the funding for the GBI proposal?	All			Yes & Option 4
A controlled habitat for regeneration of species. Exclude areas within 100 metres of foreshore.		Area within 100 metres of foreshore.		Yes
The size is way over reasonable. I would not benefit. With the harsh weather that often prevails on this coast a reserve would be too restrictive. A much smaller reserve would be acceptable.	None			Yes
The reserve at Mayor Island does not work so don't support this one. When wind blows south-west there will be nowhere to fish. Marine reserves have not been proven to be beneficial & they just stop the honest people from fishing. Do you really think that people are going to dive in the area? I have never seen a diver in the Mayor Island reserve.	All	All		Yes
"The Department of Conservation is to be advised that the Auckland Regional Council supports the establishment of a marine reserve adjoining Great Barrier Island".				Letter
SeaFIC considers proposal to be over-simplified with a lack of information about ecological values & alleged fishing impacts. The document contains confused messages about the purpose - scientific study vs. biodiversity protection. If a formal application proceeds under existing legislation, further justification of how the proposed reserve will contribute to scientific study of marine life is required. We believe the public think the government is pursuing marine reserves only in relation to the 10% protection target & recommends that the target be clarified to emphasize that a range of mechanisms can protect marine biodiversity. SeaFIC would like further information on: (a) the "network" that the proposed marine reserve is intended to contribute to, (b) why, and what, in the proposed marine reserve is representative, (c) the criteria and rationale for site selection, and an analysis of alternative sites (d) detail of the fisheries that operate in the area, type of gear used, & the nature & extent of any impact on ecological values.				Letter
I totally support the proposal. I have spent much of my life in Auckland & have visited GBI on a number of occasions & have dived & snorkeled along the coast. A reserve will protect a critical area of Auckland's offshore north-eastern coastline ecosystem. I do enjoy fishing but feel there must be areas set aside to preserve NZ's biodiversity. A reserve will enhance recreational opportunities & provide educational opportunities & bring many commercial benefits. Marine reserves provide the most comprehensive and secure protection for marine areas.				Letter

Ngati Maru Runanga formally opposes this proposal on the following grounds: 1) It compromises the interests of Ngati Maru protected by Article II of the Treaty of Waitangi. 2) It compromises the interests of Ngati Maru protected by sections 6(e), 7(a) and 8 of the Resource Management Act 1991. 3) It is contrary to Section 9 of the Hauraki Marine Park Act 2000. 4) There has been no consultation with Ngati Maru regarding this proposal. We wish to be heard at the appropriate hearing relating to our submission.				Letter
Sanford operates 7 inshore trawling boats from Auckland & all its domestic purse seining vessels from Tauranga. Sanford supports in principle the establishment of marine reserves. Sanford has several concerns: the proposal is the result of inappropriate government policy, the proposal does not quantify commercial fishing effort in the area, the Quota Management System has not been considered in relation to this proposal, & there are already large areas of the marine environment under some form of protection. Sanford would like further information on a number of issues related to the proposal. Sanford is concerned that people believe marine reserves will increase fish numbers. Sanford believes that recreational fishing can have just as large an impact as other sectors, is concerned about the cost-benefit ration of the proposal. In summary, Sanford opposes the proposal.				Letter
Our policy on marine reserves is that they are only justified where an area has been clearly identified as being so special or unique that its continuation is the national interest. We oppose this proposal because: 1) The timing is bad. 2) The justification of reserve is frail & the science is speculative. 3) The proposal document contains some errors. 4) We understand that sites for other marine reserves have been identified nearby & we oppose a piecemeal approach to marine reserve establishment. 5) Proposal is unenforceable. 6) The adverse effects on members will be considerable e.g. loss of sheltered fishing conditions in westerly weather. 7) The precedent of closing an area out to the 12nm limit. 8) The proposal fails to identify threats to area. 9) The proposal implies current fishing practice is the only threat to marine habitats & does not address issues such as algal blooms. 10) We have one of the best fishing management systems in the world already. 12) The consultation process has been inadequate. 13) DOC is using this process to refine its proposal according to the 'whinge factor'.				Letter
There is already a large area of no-fishing in the Navy area. The simple answer to conserving stocks is banning all commercial fishing, especially during spawning seasons. Amateur fishing is not a problem. If I have fish on board my boat & anchor overnight I risk prosecution. Boaties need safe anchorages & this area does supply them - if a reserve, someone risks losing their life.	All	All		Yes
Not provided.				Yes
The companies fully supports the SeaFIC submission (#936).				Letter
GBI is unique area & should remain open to use by all New Zealanders. Public education would be a better way of looking after our heritage rather than removing a huge area from use. There is no scientific proof. The proposal document is misleading & confused. You shouldn't take such a large chunk of a very small island in one sweep. Proposal is a danger to boaties. A dangerous precedent will be set if the reserve goes ahead anywhere near current size without scientific justification. Could GBI cope with a large population explosion? Can DOC cope with the potential sewage and accommodation demands? DOC couldn't manage it. Previous grievances against DOC.	All			Yes
The area in question is a marine reserve in its own right due to weather, location & isolation. It has the best offshore deep sea fishing & hapuka grounds. If Ministry of Fisheries can't control the commercial & recreational fishing then how would they manage with this extra area to police?	Part	All		Yes
I like to fish and dive this area. I believe recreational fishing pressure on area is sustainable. I am in favour of the estuary being protected.	None			Yes
We are users of this area & wish to be involved in the consent process. We endorse the desirability of many more marine reserves around our coastline but we consider this proposal to have a basic flaw & register our objection in its present format. We suggest amended boundaries to protect half of Arid Island, meaning comparative scientific research can be done. The area is relatively inaccessible which invalidates the prime requirement of a marine reserve - public access. We suggest a similar area but running from a point on the east coast eastward & bisecting Arid Island. We also suggest a small reserve on the west side of GBI.	All	Areas 4 & 8 & part of areas 2 & 5.	Areas 3, 6 & 7 & part of areas 2 & 5.	Letter

948	28.07.03		not given							Not given										N	OO
949	Undated	Milford	Auckland			Y				OC		1	1	1						Y	QS
950	Undated	Herne Bay	Auckland				Y			OC		1	1	1	1					N	OO
951	14.07.03	Clarks Beach	Pukekohe				Y			OC		1		1						N	OO
952	Undated	Epsom	Auckland				Y		Y	OC					1				Y	Y	S
953	14.07.03	Whangaparaoa	Auckland				Y			O		1		1						N	OO
954	14.07.03	Half Moon Bay	Auckland				Y			OC		1	1		1					N	OO
955	14.07.03		Auckland				Y			OC		1	1	1						Y	QS
956	14.07.03	North Beach	Christchurch 8009				Y			OC		1	1		1					Y	QS
957	14.07.04	Opuia	Bay of Islands	Mako Charters (Owner)			Y			OC		1								N	OO
958	14.07.03	Point Wells RD 6	Warkworth							Not given										Not given	OO
959	15.07.03	Mt Wellington	Auckland				Y			OC		1	1	1						N	OO
960	15.07.03		not given				Y			OC		1								N	OO
961	15.07.03	RD 1 Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				OC				1						Y	S
962	15.07.03	Stanmore Bay	Whangaparaoa				Y			O	1		1	1	1	1				N	OO
963	16.07.03	Richmond	Nelson							N		1	1	1	1	1	1			N	OO

My only recreation is fishing these areas, want to preserve the right to do so and for my sons in the future.				Fax
The fish will benefit. Future generations may benefit. The outer area has migratory fish passing through so not used for breeding area.	All	Areas 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.	Yes
I believe managing the commercial harvest and policing both commercial and recreational harvest is a much broader and effective result without the "rights" infringement. You should open your minds and explore other options - I am sure a much better solution for all can be achieved.				Yes
Do not support proposal because the area is isolated and exposed to extremes of weather - I believe these are natural protectors of this area. I don't believe there will be any benefit to myself or the environment. A total ban on take is not the answer to what DOC perceives as a decline in fish numbers. May be better to have seasonal take, which would also be an easier system to police.		All		Yes
Benefits have been well defined and are laudable. Wholeheartedly support proposal, understand fisherman's point of view but the numbers are such that the time has come.				Yes
I believe in the right of New Zealanders to feed themselves from the sea. Commercial rights should be curtailed first if stocks are under threat and next a moratorium during breeding months considered - not banning New Zealanders rights. The proposal has no benefits for recreational fishermen. Stop trying to gloss over the fact that many other areas are already unavailable to fishing.	All	All		Yes
Area too extensive. Other resource management tools if policed properly will produce the same result. The restrictions to recreational fishing are unacceptable. Need adequate funding to enforce the conservation laws currently in place before a marine reserve is considered.	All			Yes
Will not support proposal if it is this extensive as it would eliminate diving and fishing around Arid Island & increase pressure on west coast of GBI. Happy with the estuary in a reserve. There are enforcement issues.	None	Areas 4 & 5.	Areas 2, 3, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
Support proposal if it is more limited in size than the proposal area. The entire estuary should be in the reserve. Recreational fishing is a legitimate family activity. Proposed reserve provides only worthwhile fishing area around the island so will eliminate all or most recreational fishing. There are some unique habitats to preserve but there is no need for such an extensive reserve to be established. Have you considered the impact on the Auckland marine industry?	None		Areas 6 & 8.	Yes
This is a valuable recreational fishing area in strong west & south-west winds and offers big game fishing. Area is frequently visited by charter recreational vessels from Auckland & other North Island areas. I do not think any benefits will outweigh disadvantages. DOC has lost credibility saying it has support from locals, questions on form are slanted to get a favourable response.	All	All		Yes
There is no point in this proposal as it all belongs to the Maori. I have had enough of laws and rules for whites and none for the blacks.				Yes
Best area for recreational fishing in NZ. No need for reserve. If you are worried about fishing, ban commercial boats from at least 1 mile off GBI. If there is to be a reserve, it should be a lot smaller.		Areas 3, 5 & 6.		Yes
No viable reason has yet been tendered by DOC or any other organisation. We do not need a marine reserve here.				Yes
The scenic experience of diving will be enhanced by greater number and size of fish and crayfish.				Yes
I support a recreational reserve instead that is open to recreational & customary fishing. Marine reserves impact on our customary right to gather food & recreate and should be replaced with recreational reserves.	All	All		Yes
I am vehemently opposed to marine reserves and no take areas as a form of fisheries management. Limits and method restrictions must be put in place on 100% of our coast, not 10%. I will be deprived of my existing right to get a feed. What about supplying more information on the negative effects of marine reserves?	All	All		Yes

964	16.07.03	RD 2, Te Puna	Tauranga				Y				O			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO	
965	16.07.03		Tokoroa					Y			OC			1							N	OO	
966	16.07.03		Auckland						Y		N								Y		N	OO	
967	30.06.03		Auckland	Pagrus Auratus Co Ltd (Chairman)							Not given										Not given	Not given	
968	01.04.03										Not given										N	OO	
969	21.06.03		Omaha								Not given										N	OO	
970	Undated	RD1 HNDI	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO	
971	17.07.03	RD 6	Masterton						Y		N										N	OO	
972	17.07.03	RD 1 Upper Moutere	Nelson				Y				OC			1							N	OO	
973	17.07.03	Ellerslie	Auckland					Y			OC			1			1			1	N	OO	
974	17.07.03	Ranui	Auckland	Tuatea fishing Co Ltd (fisherman)			Y				O			1	1	1	1	1				N	OO
975	Undated	St Heliers	Auckland	Outboard Boating Club (member)			Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO	
976	09.07.03	Mission Bay	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO	
977	30.06.03	Pukekohe	Auckland	Moana Pacific Fisheries Ltd (Chief Executive)							Not given										Not given	Not given	
978	09.07.03	Remuera	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO	

I contend that one cannot make a decision until we know the extent of Auckland Conservancy's intention for no-take areas. I am not against marine reserves but the 1971 act is old & currently a new act is imminent. I do not believe I will benefit under the old act. All areas should be excluded until proper public consultation with public meetings in Auckland is carried out. All areas should be excluded until factual scientific evidence has been provided - this is a minimum requirement before the proposal can be put forward. Why the contempt for alternative interest or methods?	All	All		Yes & Option 4
A well managed marine park is a more suitable option. There is no benefit from a marine reserve. I will support the concept of a marine park but not the total exclusion concept of a marine reserve.		All		Yes
Proposal is not related to relaxation or land based pollution. Do not want a marine reserve, don't spend money on this!	All	All		Yes
The company fully supports the SeaFIC submission (#936).				Letter
Petition with around 400 signatures that states: "Objections to proposed marine reserve. We need to do something about this fast, before our rights are further eroded. If this reserve goes ahead it will mean no recreational fishing or shellfish gathering from this entire area including Whangapoua estuary. Do you want this?"				Petition
Form letter that states: "This is my official submission. I/We oppose the Marine Reserve proposal on north east coast of Great Barrier Island".				Form letter
Not needed. We have enough laws in place. Just have to get people to help police it.				Yes
I don't believe marine reserves will solve NZ's problems with falling fish stocks. We should be focusing our attention on the commercial sector entirely. Reserves generally penalise locals who traditionally fish in the area. My theory is that trawling & other commercial activity kills non-target species & undersize species. We need to address this. Need inspectors on all boats and improvement of catch methods to reduce waste.				Yes
This area is too important to recreational fishers & sailors. To lock up this special area would be a shame. Marine reserves are not needed & place extra pressure on other areas. Other mechanisms should be used: reduce bag limits, reduce commercial pressure, increase penalties & fines, increase peoples' knowledge and respect for this beautiful part of country and ocean.				Yes
Not necessary. No benefit. The funds spent on proposal would have been far better allocated to educating public e.g. new arrivals and fisher people.	All	All		Yes
The extent of area is too vast - going out to the 12 mile limit is ludicrous. No benefit in my mind as the extraction of species in this area is not high. Fish species move naturally from area to area, not from green votes or scientific mismanagement. As a responsible commercial fisher I state this area is too large to be of benefit to the general public as diving or snorkeling in water over 50 meters deep is only in the realms of a few people. To me this is a stepping stone to closing off vast areas to commercial and recreational people. There is already a reserve in the Navy area.				Yes
Proposal will force recreational fishers in small boats offshore in dangerous waters. Targeted species, primarily snapper, are not threatened, so why the reserve? There are no benefits - spend your efforts controlling environmental issues such as runoff. The marine reserve industry is out of control & will result in the most civil protest since the Springbok tour. Stop suggesting have support from the majority of GBI residents.	All			Yes
There is no evidence, scientific or otherwise, to suggest a reserve will achieve any improvement in the environment or increased recreational fishing benefits. There are better ways of managing the fishery. The questions are contrived towards providing support for reserve irrespective of the responses.	All	All		Yes
The company fully supports the SeaFIC submission (#936).				Letter
Not enough information supplied about any problems that exist at present regarding present usage. I need to see pros and cons of specific areas before making an informed decision. You downplay the fact that the Navy zone is already a de facto reserve.				Yes

979	Undated			Piako Dive Club (Member)			Y					OC			1	1	1								N	OO
980	Undated	Browns Bay	Auckland				Y					O			1		1								N	OO
981	09.07.03	Manukau City	Auckland	Outboard Boating Club Auckland (Member)			Y					O			1	1									N	OO
982	9.07.03	Howick	Auckland				Y					OC			1	1	1	1							N	OO
983	Undated	Rocky Bay	Waiheke Island					Y				OC													Y	S
984	21.07.03	Devonport	Auckland				Y					O			1		1	1							N	OO
985	21.07.03		Matamata					Y				OC			1	1									Y	QS
986	18.07.03	West Harbour	Auckland				Y					OC			1	1	1								N	OO
987	Undated	Glendowie	Auckland					Y				OC				1									Y	S
988	22.07.03	Horotiu	Horotiu				Y					O	1		1									1	N	OO
989	22.07.03	Orakei	Auckland				Y					OC			1	1	1	1							N	OO
990	22.07.03	RD3	Whangarei	Leigh Fishermen's Association								Not given													N	OO
991	21.07.03		Auckland	Ngati Whatua								Not given													Not given	QO
992	25.07.03	Rothsay Bay	Auckland				Y					OC			1		1	1					1		N	OO
993	30.06.03	RD1	Whitianga				Y					OC			1	1		1							N	QO

Proposal is too restrictive to private recreational use. All areas should be free from commercial fishing. Fishing regulations & daily bag limits should apply to all New Zealanders regardless of race or creed including commercial operators.				Yes
Superb recreational fishing area suitable for all forms of fishing. It appears DOC are determined to close off best fishing areas in the Hauraki Gulf - see also the Tiri proposal.	All	All		Yes
No comment. Stop fishing boats working there.				Yes
Area has limited access at the moment. Marine reserves should be established in areas that need to build up populations of fish life etc e.g. some areas in Auckland.		All		Yes
Marine reserve has to happen as more people are fishing and the commercial fishing people don't observe the rules of the inshore fishing.				Yes
This area is the only sheltered place on eastern side of GBI in which we can safely boat. Reserve should be in areas not frequented by recreational users. They also should not be in areas which provide safe havens & boating in adverse weather conditions.		Areas 2, 3, 5, 6 & 7.	South eastern area - at least south of Arid Island.	Yes
Would support a smaller reserve if all users were in agreement. Thinks the area should be policed better. Please get consensus of opinions from all users before sneaking these marine reserves in before all users are aware of what you are planning.	All			Yes
Do not support reserve because of the restrictions it will place on fishing & diving. GBI has some of best fishing & diving and it should be accessible to all. Would rather see a reduction in catch limits.	All	All		Yes
A special place to leave for our future generations and for our own special family. No reason for excluding any areas.	None	None		Yes
It has not been shown a reserve is necessary, case is not based on scientific evidence. There are existing frameworks to protect sensitive areas & there is insufficient local support. Area receives little fishing pressure at present. I think a coordinated approach to marine protection is required before this proposal proceeds. DOC has not advertised the process to my satisfaction. DOC has not adequately answered a number of questions including: why is fishing the only threat, what is so unique in the area that is requires no-take protection, why have defacto marine reserves have not been studied as marine reserves, what scientific study can be undertaken in a reserve that cannot be undertaken while fishing continues etc. There is no scientific evidence produced that this is necessary. Proposed reserve is driven by a politically motivated agenda and has no scientific credibility.	All	All		Yes & Letter & Option 4
Area is already protected by its remoteness. There are better areas closer to Auckland - like breeding areas at Rakino, Tiri or Ponui. The south-east area to the south of the Navy zone would make a better reserve. Consultation process should have occurred earlier, not when DOC's plans are so far advanced. A reserve in the proposed location would ruin the pleasure of visiting the area.		All	Rakino, Tiritiri Matangi or Ponui Islands. South-east GBI.	Yes
Form letter that states: "I oppose the proposal for the above marine reserve. There should be no more marine reserves until such time as an overall strategic plan for the whole of NZ is tabled to the public".				Form letter
GBI proposal presents an opportunity for DOC to be seriously talking about establishing a shared approach to establishing a hybrid mix of marine tools. This would allow manawhenua kaitiaki to identify & protect their customary title to a specified rohe & customary kaimoana grounds while also acknowledging the wider proposal. Seabed & foreshore issue will have an impact on the implementation process of marine reserves. Not in support of current proposal but do support a marine protection area on GBI. A mix of mgmt tools could be used, including taiapure & mataitai. I support Ngati Rehua identifying areas of ancestral significance that are still significant & support rangitiratanga & kaitiakitanga over any such identified areas.				Letter
Do not support proposal because, depending on winds this is where I fish, dive, snorkel, swim etc. I use the area 4-6 times per year. I like to be able to choose where I go depending on weather and tides. The area should not be a reserve without consultation over a 2-3 year period where all have their say & evidence is established to show depletion has happened & that a reserve would definitely help.		Areas 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.		Yes & Option 4
I strongly object to this proposal. While I am happy that a marine reserve is established somewhere on the GBI coast it is imperative that the waters around Harotaonga Bay & Arid Is are left for visiting boaties to fish in.		Areas 4 & 5.		Email

994	28.07.03		Palmerston North						Y	N				1	1							Y	QS	
995	24.07.03		Ohope 3085						Y	N												N	OO	
996	30.07.03	Whangaparaoa 1463	Auckland			Y				O				1								N	QO	
997	30.07.03	Auckland Central	Auckland			Y				O				1	1	1	1					1	N	OO
998	31.07.03	Birkenhead	Auckland			Y				O				1	1	1	1						N	QO
999	31.07.03	Mt Eden	Auckland							Not given													Y	QS
1000	30.07.03	Okiwi	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y			O	1	1		1	1	1							Y	QS
1001	30.06.03	Waiwera	Auckland				Y			OC				1	1		1	1				1	N	OO
1002	30.06.03	Castor Bay	Auckland			Y				O				1	1	1	1					1	Not given	Not given
1003	30.06.03	Orewa	Auckland				Y			O				1			1					1	N	OO
1004	30.06.03	One Tree Hill	Auckland	Outboard Boating Club (member)			Y		Y	OC				1		1	1					1	N	OO
1005	30.06.03	Glendowie	Auckland				Y			O				1		1	1					1	N	OO
1006	30.06.03	Birkenhead	Auckland				Y			OC				1			1						N	OO
1007	30.06.03	Hannahs Bay	Rotorua				Y		Y	OC				1	1	1						1	N	OO
1008	27.06.03		Orewa				Y			O				1								1	N	OO
1009	26.06.03	Birkdale	Auckland																			1	N	OO

Support the principle if area was smaller as concerned about size & position of proposal because the area is important recreational fishing area.				Yes
I disagree with concept of marine reserves being pressured on people of NZ at present. DOC should abandon its aggressive proliferation of the marine reserve concept.				Yes
I wish to retain right to fish from rocks & in a boat on the north east coast & around Rakitu. I would have no objection to a reserve that started 1 mile east of Rakitu & extended out to the 12 nautical mile limit. Nowhere in the literature could I find the proposed size in hectares of the reserve.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.	Areas 6 & 8.	Yes
It is my right to fish & dive in this area.	All	All		Yes & Option 4
Have fished in area for many years & fishing has been improving in recent years as less commercial fishing. Choose area that is less sheltered rather than picking the prime boating area. If there must be a reserve, make it from Whakatautuna Point south as much of this is already off limits due to the Navy zone.		Areas 2, 3 & 4.	Area south of Whakatautuna Point including the Navy zone.	Yes
Marine reserves provide long term benefits to wider community of NZ, to scientific community, to life in general. Reserves provide ecosystem approach to marine conservation. Also good for education & recreation, tourism opportunities. Good opportunity to protect area from mountain top to deep sea. Residents of GBI should have continued access to harvesting in area.	Part for locals			Letter
We object to the current proposal on the following grounds: 1) Small time recreational fishers do not adversely affect the environment so area can be protected without banning recreational fishers. 2) We rely on fishing etc during months we spend on island as this forms part of our diet. We conditionally support marine protection as follows: 1) In a way that allows recreational users the right to subsistence hunt/gather without the need for expensive 'off-shore' boats. 2) A system that allowed greater restrictions on catch limits where advantageous. 3) We support the banning of commercial fishing in GBI waters as we believe depleted stocks are almost entirely attributable to these businesses. We would support a marine reserve & marine park in area, as shown on map.	All	Areas 2, 3, 4 & 5 should be protected as a marine park.	Areas 6, 7 & 8.	Yes & letter
We should be able to use our resource. No more no-take reserves anywhere ever. The Quota Management System looks after the resource. Why can't we have partial closures for certain areas for periods of time e.g. rahui or closure during spawning season? We have been given this resource to manage & use, not to take it away from us forever.	All	All		Option 4
The wrong users are being targeted in relation to this proposal - commercial fishers need to be looked at.				Option 4
Area is sufficiently isolated & protected by distance & weather. Wider consultation is needed & more time to make submissions would have been diplomatic. I am an ex-member of committee that set up Long Bay marine reserve & there was a wide advertising & information sharing campaign - why is it different for DOC? Reserve legislation should be less stringent & allow more local control & less permanent reserves.				Option 4
Strict quotas for commercial & recreational fishing would achieve same thing if properly policed. Areas should only be protected if they are of unique scientific interest e.g. species in area that are not found anywhere else in region.	None			Option 4
Large increase in marine farms means less area for recreational activity. I fish in proposed area for game fish. Navy zone nearby is already closed. Weather affords the area natural protection. There has been little public consultation & I seek clarification of the impact a reserve would have on area. This area is one of a few that provides a variety of deep water fish in the season that is accessible from Auckland. As a NZ citizen & taxpayer my family & I should retain the right to fish for food. We are left feeling that the people driving this change are not acting in the best interests of all New Zealanders. They are supposed to be the servants of the people.				Option 4
Have not viewed the proposal but believe it may lead to total exclusion of recreational fishers from area. Area will be difficult to police. More public consultation, options & discussions needed. No reserve should proceed until all relevant users have been consulted & provided with scientific data. Support the concept of marine parks.				Option 4
Not enough research done or public consultation.				Option 4
It is an excellent recreational fishing area. Why will DOC not attend public meetings>				Option 4
I support properly managed areas for all to enjoy.				Option 4

1010	26.06.03	Warkworth	Warkworth				Y			OC			1		1			1	N	QO
1011	26.06.03	Martinborough	Wairarapa	Pukemanu Boating & Fishing Club (Vice Commodore)			Y			OC			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1012	26.06.03	Waimahia Landing	Auckland	Ngai Tahu			Y			OC	1		1	1			1	1	N	OO
1013	26.06.03	Nawton	Hamilton				Y			OC			1	1				1	N	OO
1014	26.06.03		Whangamata				Y			O			1		1	1		1	Y	QO
1015	26.06.03		Whangamata				Y			O	1		1	1				1	N	QO
1016	26.06.03		Whangamata	Option 4 (Supporter)			Y			OC			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1017	26.06.03	Forrest Hill	Auckland				Y			OC			1					1	N	OO
1018	26.06.03	Silverdale	Auckland	Hibiscus Boating Club (member)			Y			O			1	1	1	1			N	OO
1019	26.06.03	Whitford	Auckland				Y			O			1		1			1	N	OO
1020	26.06.03	St Marys Bay	Auckland	Riviera Owners (dealer)			Y			O			1					1	N	OO
1021	26.06.03	Beachlands	Auckland	CPFC, CPGFC (member)			Y			O			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1022	22.08.03	Remuera	Auckland				Y			O			1	1		1			N	QO
1023	26.06.03		Thames				Y			O			1	1	1			1	N	QO
1024	22.08.03		Bombay				Y			O			1		1				N	OO
1025	26.06.03	Eastern Beach	Auckland				Y			OC			1					1	N	OO
1026	30.06.03	Takanini	Auckland				Y			OC			1		1	1		1	N	OO
1027	20.07.03	East Hills, Sydney, NSW	Australia				Y			OC			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1028	19.07.03	Remuera	Auckland			Y				O			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1029	19.07.03	Petone	Wellington				Y			OC			1					1	N	OO
1030	18.07.03	Galatea	RD1 Murupara															1	N	OO

Estuary is worthy of a marine reserve but rest of proposed area is too large. And it should be a reserve for all New Zealanders. Do not support marine reserves anywhere until a proposed marine reserve network is tabled by DOC, until independent scientific evidence is provided to show reserves work & that fishing is the main threat, until there is a process where reserves can be dropped if they don't work. Weather conditions limit fishing pressure. Exclude commercial fishers but bag limits mean that recreational fishing should continue.				Option 4
There is no scientific evidence to prove that a reserve has any beneficial effect on fish stocks except within immediate boundaries of reserve.				Option 4
In principle yes but not in the non-consultative DOC manner. Believe DOC has already made their decision with a nod from the Minister responsible. Their actions are one-sided and non-consultative.				Option 4
I would like it to remain an open fishing area. These types of proposals need more consultation & public notice. DOC seem to be a law unto themselves.				Option 4
We will only benefit if reserve is in the right place. I am continually horrified in the erosion of our rights to recreational fishing.				Option 4
There are already enough reserves but, if absolutely necessary, only a small reserve so we can still go fishing. Exclude estuary as it is a safe anchorage if you get caught in a northerly wind.	All			Option 4
Leave our coast alone as it is our "god-given" right. We have lasted many years with self regulation & don't need to be told what to do.	All	All		Option 4
Better ways to manage & protect the marine environment & life without creation of marine reserves. Area is isolated so will not benefit from excluding recreational fishers. No ground should be given to compromise with DOC.		All		Option 4
Lack of integrity by applicants. If a reserve was established it would close a massive area off from recreational fishing & put greater pressure on other areas. This proposal is just DOC attempting to grow their empire. DOC & Forest & Bird are just trying to gain as much control as possible over our marine environment while there is a sympathetic government in power. Consultation is being stifled by misinformation.	All	All		Option 4
Restricts recreational fishing over large area.				Option 4
Recreational fishing doesn't harm the resource. Would not benefit anything or anyone. Area is visited by relatively few people & would have no benefit to anyone. It would only create a position for someone to administer the area at the taxpayers expense.				Option 4
Commercial fishing should be stopped but not recreational fishing as it is limited to a small number of boats anyway. I only take around 20 fish per year from the area.	All			Option 4
A "sea grab" by DOC not based on any statistics to prove the necessity of a reserve. I will not benefit. If certain areas need protection then prove it & I will support that portion as a reserve.				Yes
Area has its own protection because exposure to elements so is often inaccessible. Southern half of Whangapoua beach, Arid Island & everything south should be excluded.	All	Areas 2, 4, 5 & 8.		Option 4
We believe we have enough reserves. GBI is isolated enough not to require a reserve. All New Zealanders should have access to this area.				Yes
There are other places more suitable for a reserve.				Option 4
It is unnecessary & I won't benefit. DOC is about conservation not preservation & the ocean is there to use (read fishing) not to be locked away for exclusive use by some people.				Option 4
There are better ways to protect the fish e.g. total ban of all commercial fishing. I have been fishing on this island since I was a child & am well aware of the decline in fish stocks. I find it hard to believe that local recreational fishers are a major threat to fish stocks compared to the netting & dredging I have seen in the area.				Option 4
Because this is an area I have been visiting the area for 20 years & I don't want a marine reserve there. Proposal is being pushed through with only token consultation.	All	All		Option 4
I don't believe marine reserves work. No benefit to myself or others.		All		Option 4
Not scientific proven need for such a reserve.				Option 4

1031	18.07.03	New Lynn	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1		1			1	N	OO
1032	17.07.03	Blockhouse Bay	Auckland					Y			OC			1			1	1		1	N	OO
1033	18.07.03		Kaitaia					Y			OC				1					1	Y	S
1034	18.07.03	East Tamaki	Auckland					Y			O			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1035	18.07.03	Te Puna	Tauranga					Y			OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1036	18.07.03	Takanini	Auckland					Y			OC			1		1	1			1	N	OO
1037	18.07.03	Titirangi	Auckland						Y		N			1	1		1			1	N	OO
1038	18.07.03	Ponsonby	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1039	18.07.03		Rotorua					Y			OC			1			1			1	N	OO
1040	18.07.03		Nelson						Y		N									1	N	OO
1041	17.07.03	Waiuku	Auckland					Y			OC			1						1	N	OO
1042	17.07.03		Taupo					Y			OC			1						1	N	OO
1043	16.07.03	Takapuna	Takapuna					Y			OC			1		1				1	N	OO
1044	15.07.03	Takanini	Auckland	Charter Operator (Captain)				Y			OC			1	1	1				1	N	OO

Unnecessary idiocy by DOC that will eliminate my family from my customary right as a kiwi. You have no moral right to exterminate my customary right to harvest for my family or restrict my future generations from this right. If you work with all stakeholders to promote your views we will listen & have a robust discussion.				Option 4
Ridiculously huge area. I won't benefit & do not like this cloak & dagger stuff from DOC.				Option 4
By believing that I may have helped preserve something important for future generations. Areas of greatest use need greatest protection. I have difficulty understanding why Option 4 is not supporting the implementation of marine reserves based on the overwhelming international scientific evidence showing how degraded the world fisheries are. Marine reserves may not be the most sophisticated approach but if we wait until all the studies are done, we wait forever & there may be nothing left to protect. Let's work together & be proactive to ensure there will be some fish for a feed in the future.				Option 4
No requirement for area to be a marine reserve. I have not seen any truthfully documented reason to create a marine reserve anywhere on GBI & provided commercial interests are honestly controlled this should not change. Only benefit would be if it protected fish breeding grounds or an endangered marine organism in the area.	All	All		Option 4
More consultation first & realistic time frames. Show me your scientific evidence of benefits. Justify your conclusions with facts, not assumptions. Exclude all areas until agreement can be concluded with the public. Why only public meetings in Auckland & not in the rest of the country where you will get a strong public attendance at any meeting?	All	All		Option 4
It is not necessary. I won't benefit. Access to area is already limited due to weather & isolation. Efforts should be concentrated on illegal fishing & plundering of resources. Greater control of inshore commercial fishing would be an advantage.				Option 4
Marine reserves lock away the resource without reasonable study to prove it is necessary. Waters close to shore should be excluded to allow recreational fishing. Marine reserves are a reasonable idea but the issue is location and why. Without a plan showing all possible marine reserves in NZ I cannot support any of them. The right to fish should be a given as should the right to walk or swim on any NZ beach. Not sure what you are trying to achieve with this proposal. My biggest concern is that 2 government departments, DOC & Ministry of Fisheries, are not approaching the issue in tandem. One wants to lock the resource away & one wants to give it away.		Areas within 500 metres of shoreline.		Option 4
I am unlikely to benefit. Inadequate research to date. No coastal areas need protection based on the research I have seen. I would like to see this proposal scrapped & any other coastal control policy put to the public as a referendum.	All	All		Option 4
Not necessary. I will not benefit. DOC should allow more public consultation before closing submissions. They do not allow interested baddies enough time to prepare adequate submissions. Will stop me from recreational fishing in area. DOC should hold public meetings to discuss the issues.	All	All		Option 4
Too many areas being locked up for no public or private benefit. No one who uses this area currently will benefit from the proposal. I have no objection to enhancement of fisheries but the enhancement must be real & not detract from enjoyment of areas currently available for use. The simple pleasure of fishing to catch a feed with my kids should not be thought less important than having huge areas locked up for study by scientists or those who choose to view it underwater.	All	All		Option 4
It should be my right as a New Zealander to fish in these waters. If you are worried about depleting resources, why not enforce a lower daily bag limit instead? Why will tangata whenua still be able to gather from the reserve?				Option 4
Poor consultation with affected public.				Option 4
Why not Fitzroy as a principle? I nor my family will benefit. I cannot understand who is to benefit from this marine reserve. There is no evidence to suggest that fish will benefit & the location is self protected by its location.				Option 4
No reserve required, it would be detrimental to people, peoples' enjoyment will be spoiled & so will their freedom to feed their family & friends. Having a reserve on GBI would be a crime. It would stop my customers fishing & diving & swimming on GBI and this would affect my income. How would I feed my grandchildren when they visited?	All	All		Option 4

1045	15.07.03		Warkworth						Y	OC								1	N	QO
1046	15.07.03	Maraetai Bch	Auckland				Y			OC								1	N	OO
1047	15.07.03	Wainuiomata	Wellington						Y	N									N	OO
1048	15.07.03	Stanmore Bay	Auckland			Y				O			1		1			1	N	QO
1049	15.07.03	Sandringham	Auckland			Y				O			1	1	1			1	N	OO
1050	15.07.03	Glenfield	Auckland				Y			OC			1					1	N	QO
1051	15.07.03	Three Kings	Auckland				Y			OC			1					1	N	OO
1052	15.07.03	Half Moon Bay	Auckland			Y				OC			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1053	15.07.03	Howick	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1					N	QO
1054	15.07.03	RD8	Hamilton						Y	OC			1					1	N	OO
1055	15.07.03	Albany	Auckland				Y			OC			1		1	1		1	N	OO
1056	15.07.03	Henderson	Auckland			Y				O			1	1	1			1	N	OO
1057	15.07.03	Panmure	Auckland						Y	N									N	OO
1058	14.07.03	Remuera	Auckland	Outboard Boating Club of Auckland (Executive member)			Y			OC			1					1	N	OO
1059	15.07.03	D-82131 Gauting	Germany		Y	Y				OC								1	Y	S

Not opposed to marine reserves in principle as long as benefits outweigh objectives. But as far as I can see they don't in any way. My comments are: 1) Marine reserves are apparently supposed to rebuild depleted stocks of snapper, crayfish & other species yet no research has been carried out by DOC & there are no substantial scientific results showing depletion of any fish stocks. 2) Why do we have a Quota Management System? Isn't it supposed to control fish stocks? If there is depletion & marine reserves are being proposed, why have commercial quotas increased? 3) The Auckland Regional Council proposal for Tawharanui marine reserve shows protection of the area as a marine park for 26 years has not increased fish numbers. 4) In 1991 all the crayfish in Goat Island marine reserve walked out which proves that reserves with closed boundaries do not work. 5) DOC & MFish should work closer together & do more research on this topic.				Option 4
No benefit. DOC needs to complete a study to determine the impact of a marine reserve before applying for one. If they are concerned that marine life is being affected by fishing then DOC should first consider a marine park to restrict commercial activities in the area. Area is already protected by its isolation & weather conditions. A reserve seems ridiculous & of no benefit to anyone.				Option 4
No scientific studies have been done. People need to know the facts & benefits of marine reserves prior to them being established. Please do some research to back your reasons for shutting out a lot of responsible fishing folk.	All			Option 4
Don't support proposal as it stands because it extends over too much of the best fishing area in the Hauraki Gulf. Remove commercial fishing as it will help recreational. Estuary should be included in a reserve as it is only big estuary on coast. Do not protect Needles & south along east coast as is a top fishing spot when weather is blowing from west.	None	Area 3.		Option 4
No logical reason for the reserve in this area & public support must count for something. These questions are premeditated to get answers which appear to support the reserve so I have not answered them.				Option 4
Any reserve should be where fishing pressure is e.g. western side of GBI or perhaps somewhere near Wellington Head. It is nonsense to suggest tourists will be interested in going to north-east area to dive & sightsee.			West side of GBI.	Option 4
Recent explosion of proposed reserves is out of control & recreational fishers seem to be the target. There should be no reserve. There is no benefit.	All	All		Option 4
The north east corner of GBI provides the major anchorages & therefore is most accessible fishing & diving locations for that side of GBI. I do not want to go south or north around the top of the Barrier to catch a fish.		All		Option 4
Support the principle of marine reserves but why on the north east coast of GBI versus anywhere else? There may be an overflow effect from the fish within the reserve moving out but I need evidence of that. Concern about DOC contact with interested parties - have notices gone out to all fishing clubs, have notices been posted at boat ramps? If DOC pushes ahead without consulting with all interest groups it will only lead to grievances.				Option 4
This is a local recreational fishing area, reduce some commercial quota instead & enforce catch limits. Stop commercial fishing in all of Gulf.		All		Option 4
I believe in better use of what we have, commercially & recreationally. I would prefer to catch less fish than not be allowed to catch any. What about marine reserves that move allowing many areas to replenish?				Option 4
Too many reserves close to each other. No one will benefit. No more reserves.	All	All		Option 4
Insufficient needs analysis.				Option 4
Not researched enough. No benefit. No reasons have been given for the reserve to be put in such a wide area. It appears to be driven by an attitude of keeping fishermen out completely & this will put pressure on other areas. The designation of a marine reserve should not take place until adequate publicity has been made & all interested parties have had the opportunity to make submissions. The consultation comes across as being largely procedural.		All		Option 4
Indirect benefits. Landowners who visit annually. Agree with the establishment of a marine reserve on north east coast even though it will be hard for many to accept & there will be restrictions to local residents may be difficult at times.				Option 4

1060	14.07.03	Weymouth	Auckland	Ngati Whatua-Ngati Porou				Y			OC			1	1					1	N	OO
1061	14.07.03	Westmere	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1		1			1	N	OO
1062	14.07.03	Red Beach	Auckland				Y				OC			1		1				1	N	OO
1063	14.07.03	Stanmore Bay	Auckland					Y			OC			1						1	N	OO
1064	14.07.03	Massey	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1065	14.07.03	Bayswater	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1066	14.07.03	Beachlands	Auckland					Y			OC			1		1				1	N	OO
1067	14.07.03	St Heliers	Auckland				Y				O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1068	14.07.03	Hobsonville	Auckland					Y			OC			1		1				1	Y	S
1069	22.08.03	Glenfield	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1070	14.07.03	Newton	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1		1			1	Y	QS
1071	14.07.03	Remuera	Auckland				Y				O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1072	14.07.03	Hibiscus Coast	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1073	14.07.03	Symonds St	Auckland				Y				OC			1			1			1	N	OO
1074	14.07.03	Opaheke	Papakura 1703					Y			OC			1	1	1	1			1	Y	OO
1075	14.07.03	Swanson	Auckland					Y			OC			1						1	N	OO
1076	13.07.03	Torbay	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1		1			1	N	OO

Area around GBI is not frequented by the average recreational fisher or boatie. There are some professional charter boat operators in the area who provide customers with the opportunity to fish in relatively un-spoilt territory. Most charter operators have good code of conduct. More damage to our fishery comes from unscrupulous commercial operators. Should work to stop illegal fishing then we would not need marine reserves.		All		Option 4
Where is somewhere? I think there will be no benefit. GBI is a valuable recreational fishing area - there are more than enough marine reserves within a commutable distance from Auckland. There has not been enough discussion & DOC should not be group steering decisions about marine reserves.		All		Option 4
Area is too large. Exclude area in estuary for shellfish gathering. Do not protect area from Needles to Whangapoua bar. Consultation with those that the marine reserve affects would produce a better reception than just dictating what your terms are.	Part	Areas 2 & 3.		Option 4
No support unless there is proper consultation. I don't think I will benefit. Area naturally protected because of its distance from Auckland & the weather.				Option 4
I think that recreational fishing has little or no impact on fish numbers & any restrictions placed on area should be on commercial fishers as they damage the environment more.	All	All		Option 4
Can't see any benefit, no need for a reserve.	All	All		Option 4
If there is a concern for sustainable fisheries then address it through tighter catch limits & restricting commercial fishers rather than area restriction. Too many recreational fishers take too many fish & restricting where they can fish will not change this. Rather than a marine reserve, why not a marine park to restrict commercial access and, if pressure is too great, then a marine reserve?	All	All		Option 4
It is my right to fish there as I have done for many years. The government has to learn not to tamper with peoples' rights to fish in areas they have fished in for years.		All		Option 4
Not provided.				Option 4
Because it will take away my right to enjoy the area, in the way I wish to. Do not restrict the recreational uses of the area. You should be ensuring all commercial fishing do not operate in area & increase enforcement of catch limits on recreational users.	All	All		Yes
More abundant marine life with a restricted reserve. I'm a recreational fisher and in general terms the concept of marine reserves is not a problem, provided adequate research, public submissions and consultation is carried out.				Option 4
It restricts recreational fishing for no satisfactory reason. I won't benefit in any way. There should be no further marine reserves in this area. I feel that DOC have high-jacked the process & have not consulted enough with recreational fishers.		All		Option 4
Too many in greater Auckland area, put them around the islands further out and ban commercial fishing closer in.		All		Option 4
Area is rough in inclement weather & this protects it except from trawlers. Concern about Marine Reserves Bill as the purpose will change. Concerned that this proposed legislation does not provide for adequate notification, advertising or consultation process before a reserve can be established. There needs to be a concerted approach to all Members of Parliament of the need to amend the proposed marine reserves legislation as this is the key to controlling where and when reserves can be created.		All		Option 4
Size of proposal is ridiculous as it cuts off a huge area of recreational & commercial fishing waters for a very limited & unproven gain. I can't get any direct benefit from a marine reserve in this proposed location. A much smaller area, similar to Goat Island, would have benefit without the loss of important fishing waters.				Option 4
Only need to protect this coast from commercial fishing boats not recreational. Imagine the financial benefits of an overseas visitor coming to catch fish on this beautiful coast? I can't see anyone benefiting from this proposal as the GBI tourist trade will suffer if reserve established. Marine reserves should be discarded as they discourage our children from getting outdoors. Keep commercial boats well offshore so fishing stocks are not plundered (120 miles). Keep New Zealanders doing what we've grown up doing - teaching our children not to fish.	All	All		Option 4
Not provided.				Option 4

1077	13.07.03		Orewa				Y			OC			1	1					N	OO
1078	13.07.03	Coatesville	Albany			Y				OC			1		1	1		1	Y	S
1079	13.07.03	Coatesville	Albany			Y	Y			O			1	1	1	1			N	QO
1080	13.07.03	Manukau Central	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1081	12.07.03	Manurewa	Auckland					Y		N								1	N	OO
1082	12.07.03	Te Atatu Peninsula	Auckland				Y			O			1	1		1		1	N	QO
1083	12.07.03		Auckland			Y				OC			1	1		1		1	Y	S
1084	12.07.03	RD9 Inglewood	New Plymouth	Inglewood Rod, Gun & Rec Club (President)			Y			OC			1					1	N	OO
1085	10.07.03		Tekauwhata				Y			OC			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1086	10.07.03	Epsom	Auckland				Y			OC			1					1	N	OO
1087	10.07.03		Auckland			Y				O			1		1			1	N	OO
1088	10.07.03		Auckland			Y				O			1			1		1	N	OO
1089	10.07.03		Whangamata					Y		OC			1					1	N	OO
1090	10.07.03	Hukerenui	Whangarei	Kiahaanga Whakarereki Incorp Society (Executive Director)			Y			OC			1		1			1	N	OO
1091	10.07.03	Devonport	Auckland				Y			OC			1		1	1		1	Y	QS

By answering yes I am unable to indicate my suggestions. You should not be able to make a decision based on a yes or no question. I wouldn't benefit. Location of area makes it a significant natural reserve. I can't believe DOC have been able to get away with the total lack of advertising of public meetings regarding 'our' recreational rights. DOC should be totally unbiased & form a balanced approach that represents all New Zealanders. DOC are not representing all views & thoughts of NZ - they have their own agenda and are untrustworthy.	All	All		Option 4
I will not benefit in the short term but I feel future generations will benefit as the Barrier gets more established resources will diminish.	None	None		Option 4
After 25 years of recreational use of this area the only times I have seen great pressure on use of area is at Christmas time until Jan 10. I have observed 3 of last 5 Christmas periods with adverse weather & minimum pressure. Whangapoua estuary is a micro ecosystem with many endangered species & would be a great place for a marine reserve. All areas should not be protected except estuary & beach area out to 1km from land. More emphasis should be placed on policing of fishing regulations or ban on types of commercial fishing.	None		Areas 1 & 2 out to 1km from land.	Option 4
I fish there during the day & anchor there at night, have spent over \$100,000 on a boat to be able to fish at back of GBI. A reserve will not benefit me at all. We need scientific research that shows why this area should be made into a reserve, and not the other side of GBI or the southern coast of GBI? What are you going to do about the true killer of dolphins & reef fish i.e. gill nets?	All	All		Option 4
I don't believe it will benefit the people who are using the area now or in the future to have no-take areas when there hasn't been any worthwhile evidence presented to users of this area. The public needs scientific information to understand reasons for protection of area. It is clear that almost all recreational fishers are committed to protecting the future of one of our most treasured pastimes, pleasures & rights - fishing. So you need to inform and consult us in all areas of marine reserve proposals.	All			Option 4
Will only support it if it has the popular approval of interested parties. There are plenty of other areas where a reserve could be sited, with public approval. DOC needs to make a 'master plan' then submit it to the community at large to decide. Full & fair consultation must occur. I am concerned over the heavy-handed approach by a government department. There is no need to smash these proposals through. A proper public referendum should take place at a convenient time, after all discussions are complete. All reserves should have a large measure of agreement by all who use it. Only benefit will be to diving recreational industry. There are thousands of places where marine reserves can be placed, so why continually select situations where recreational fishing is a prominent activity? I am concerned about DOC's dictatorial attitude.				Option 4
Saving of fish breeding stock. Estuary should have no fishing including iwi permitted harvests.	None			Option 4
No need for a reserve. Reserve off New Plymouth only seems to attract a very large colony of seals that eat tonnes of fish, making the reserve a waste of time because the fishing around this reserve is no better. DOC are the enemy.				Option 4
Where will it end? I will not benefit.				Option 4
None given.				Option 4
There are better places for reserves. No benefit. I am frustrated that DOC is not fronting with an unbiased, well researched marine reserve proposal. There is a lack of evidence & until this is forthcoming, I am not interested in considering a reserve of any sort. DOC's questionnaire did not provide any space to ask questions such as those on the Option 4 form.		All		Option 4
It is not necessary. I wouldn't benefit.				Option 4
More information is required by DOC & the public need to be kept better informed. What is the great hurry to do this?				Option 4
No evidence that reserve will benefit the region.				Option 4
Some protection of area will ensure preservation of existing environment in perpetuity. Area is excessively large as the north-east coast is rarely accessible due to weather. A reserve from, & including, Arid Island southward would be a great compromise.		Areas 3, 6 & 7.	Rakitu Island & area south (areas 2, 4 & 5).	Option 4

1092	10.07.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland						Y											OC			1									1	Y	S
1093	9.07.03	Glenfield	Auckland						Y												O		1		1						1	N	OO	
1094	8.07.03	Cambridge Heights	Tauranga						Y												OC					1						1	Y	S
1095	8.07.03	Te Atatu Peninsula	Auckland						Y												OC		1	1	1	1							N	OO
1096	5.07.03	Ruakaka	Whangarei						Y												N		1										N	OO
1097	3.07.03	Forest Lake	Hamilton						Y												OC		1				1				1	N	OO	
1098	3.07.03	Lynfield	Auckland	Auckland Outboard Boating Club (member)					Y												O		1	1			1	1			1	N	OO	
1099	3.07.03	RD1	Tokoroa	Tokoroa Sports Fishing Association (member)					Y												OC		1	1							1	N	OO	
1100	2.07.03	Torbay	Auckland						Y												OC		1	1			1				1	N	OO	
1101	1.07.03	Whangaparaoa	Auckland						Y												O		1	1							1	N	OO	
1102	1.07.03	RD3 Tamahere	Hamilton						Y												O		1	1	1	1	1	1			1	N	OO	
1103	1.07.03	Silverdale	Auckland						Y												OC		1	1	1						1	N	OO	
1104	1.07.03	Takapuna	Auckland						Y												OC						1				1	N	OO	
1105	22.07.03	Pukekohe	Auckland						Y												OC						1				1	N	OO	
1106	22.07.03	Massey	Auckland						Y												O		1	1	1						1	N	OO	
1107	29.07.03	Army Bay	Whangaparaoa						Y												O		1	1	1						1	N	OO	
1108	29.07.03	Stanmore Bay	Whangaparaoa						Y												OC		1				1	1			1	N	OO	
1109	21.07.03	West Harbour	Auckland	West Harbour Fishing Club (secretary)					Y												OC		1								1	N	OO	
1110	21.07.03	Hillcrest	Auckland						Y												O		1				1	1			1	N	OO	
1111	21.07.03	Ponsonby	Auckland						Y												OC		1	1	1						1	Y	QS	

Preservation of fish & marine species. Area should be clearly defined now so people can make submissions for or against a specific area.				Option 4
Weather is often rough & un-fishable thereby creating a natural balance. I have fished there since childhood. No marine reserve needed anywhere near GBI or in Hauraki Gulf.		All		Option 4
Provides an area where this resource can be sustained for future generations to observe as well. NZ needs more marine reserves to protect of our natural heritage.				Option 4
Plenty of other places for a marine reserve.				Option 4
Insufficient reason for a reserve. I don't think I will benefit. I don't believe a convincing case has been made for the establishment of marine reserves. Marine reserves have not been shown to have benefits recreationally, financially or environmentally therefore & are therefore ideologically driven so I can't give my support.				Option 4
It is not recreational fishers who harm the environment - we protect & respect the wonderful marine environment in NZ. Stop all commercial fishing in 12nm radius from coast. I won't benefit from this reserve.				Option 4
It is a stupid idea proposed by minority interests without common sense or proper logic. I will not benefit. DOC should get its own house in order before it starts to impose its flawed thinking on others.		All		Option 4
Unconvinced of the need for a marine reserve.				Option 4
We have enough reserves currently.				Option 4
Need scientific proof that marine reserves are needed. I would not benefit from a reserve at all. The public are becoming very pissed off with DOC.				Option 4
Do not support proposal because of the conflict in the new legislation that allows commercial harvesting in this area to the exclusion of recreational users. Region is relatively isolated so how many New Zealanders are going to benefit? The only way private New Zealanders will benefit is if commercial fishing is excluded & the area allowed to recover its former glory. I am strongly of the opinion that NZ's future economic wellbeing will be greatly enriched by maintenance of relatively undisturbed ecosystem. Inshore commercial fishing is rapidly eroding this resource. A long term view would question the benefit of a large commercial fishing industry in NZ - sustainability has not been proven at the current level of usage. The proportion of usage by recreational fishers is very small when compared to the current level of commercial harvesting.				Option 4
Proposed area is too large & will displace too many users. There is no coordinated approach to marine reserves for total NZ coastline. The 10% target needs to be evenly spaced rather than having reserves concentrated in areas of heaviest use.		All		Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
Proposal will unnecessarily restrict the rights of NZ citizens to benefit from the resources of GBI.	All	All		Option 4
Evidence suggests no real benefits to average fisherman or boatie from the establishment of marine reserves.		All		Option 4
Because we won't be able to fish or dive there.				Option 4
Not necessary & fishing pressure not big enough to warrant a reserve.		All		Option 4
Do not support a reserve of the proposed size. Due to a lack of consultation I think the proposal should be halted immediately & an open & extensive consultation process needs to be entered into. This should be backed by scientific research as to how & why a reserve is required.				Option 4
The question is too restrictive. Marine reserves are valuable when in right locations for the right reasons after the right consultation. DOC need to listen to a wider view than their own listed groups. These issues are too important to all New Zealanders to be pushed through with undue haste.				Option 4
Great numbers of tame fish for sight-seeing dives. Only readily accessible areas should be marine reserves for divers enjoyment unless there is scientific proof that the environment is in need of protection. A 2 by 3 hectare reserve with beach access would suit me. The isolation, ruggedness & weather protect the north east coast of GBI. My observation is that the west coast is more used & in need of protection. As a fisher I think it is my responsibility to protect the environment I fish in as fishers are the main people to get enjoyment out of these areas.				Option 4

1112	26.06.03	RD2 Pukekohe	Auckland				Y				OC									1	N	OO		
1113	26.06.03	Golflands	Auckland					Y			OC									1	1	1	Y	QS
1114	26.06.03		Tauranga					Y			OC									1	1	1	N	OO
1115	26.06.03	West Harbour	Auckland					Y			OC									1	1	1	N	OO
1116	25.06.03	Greenhithe	Auckland						Y		N									1	1		N	OO
1117	25.06.03	Ellerslie	Auckland	WS Laurie & Co (Director)			Y				O									1	1	1	1	OO
1118	25.06.03	RD2	Wanganui					Y			OC									1	1		N	OO
1119	25.06.03	Northcote	Auckland					Y			OC									1	1	1	Y	OO
1120	25.06.03		Taupo					Y			OC									1			N	OO
1121	25.06.03	RD2	Waipu					Y			OC									1			Y	QS
1122	25.06.03	Mt Maunganui	Tauranga					Y			OC									1	1	1	Y	S
1123	25.06.03	Algies Bay	Warkworth				Y				OC									1	1	1	N	OO
1124	25.06.03	Orewa	Auckland 1461				Y				OC									1	1	1	N	OO
1125	25.06.03	Albany	Auckland				Y				O									1	1	1	N	OO
1126	25.06.03	Paraparaumu	Wellington	Raumati Sports Fishing Club (Committee member & weighmaster)				Y			OC									1			N	OO
1127	30.06.03	Manly	Whangaparaoa					Y			OC									1	1	1	N	OO
1128	30.06.03	Glenfield	Auckland					Y			OC									1	1	1	N	OO
1129	30.06.03	Napier South	Napier	Stream 2000 (coordinator)					Y		N												N	OO
1130	30.06.03	Te Atatu North	Auckland					Y			OC									1	1		N	OO
1131	30.06.03	Pakuranga	Auckland					Y			OC									1			N	OO
1132	30.06.03	Mission Bay	Auckland				Y				O									1	1		N	OO
1133	30.06.03	Orakei	Auckland					Y			O									1			N	OO
1134	30.06.03		Te Awamutu				Y				OC									1	1	1	N	OO
1135	30.06.03		Maungaturoto					Y			OC									1			N	OO
1136	29.06.03	Lake Tekapo	South Canterbury					Y			OC									1			N	OO
1137	29.06.03	Birkenhead	Auckland				Y				OC									1	1	1	N	OO
1138	29.06.03	Glendowie	Auckland					Y			OC									1	1	1	N	OO
1139	29.06.03		Matamata				Y				OC									1	1	1	N	OO
1140	29.06.03	Glenfield	Auckland				Y													1	1	1	N	OO

Believe the way DOC is approaching this proposal is unconstitutional & does not allow those that use the area, namely recreational fishers, to have a say.	All	All		Option 4
Protection of some area of this beautiful island. Proposal is too large. A suitable area would be 2 or 3 mile radius from the Needles. There is still little proof of the value of marine reserves in open water. Where is the proof of benefit to all users?	All	Areas 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 & 8.	Area in 2-3 mile radius from the Needles.	Option 4
No benefit to me, not enough details given about the type of reserve you mean, not enough consultation & discussion has been had. The matter should be discussed by the people who use the area, not just locals.				Option 4
Better controls available than marine reserves e.g. use size & catch limits to control the resource. Marine reserves will not replenish the overall resource. Fish stocks are in excellent condition. Reserve would place more pressure on other areas.	All			Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
It would take all the fun out of my visit & stop me getting a meal of fish.				Option 4
Nil benefit.				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
Reserves are a haven for fish that 'assist' repopulation of the area. No one has a problem with reserves if they are in an easily designated area, able to be accessed by most forms of transport, or in a place with low recreational use. This reserve has problems including lack of public access leading to area being almost un-policed. Area proposed is too big.				Option 4
A small controlled area for future generations security.				Option 4
Enough no-fishing areas around NZ already. DOC should designate cable zones as marine reserves as these areas have same bottom habitat as GBI. If DOC are serious about conservation why not concentrate on cleaning the pollution going into the sea?				Option 4
It favours a selected few who dive & bans the majority who fish in the area. I will not benefit as it will ban me from the area. We don't need marine reserves because the fish & sea life is improving every year - all the government has to do is keep trawlers out. DOC are being misled by a bunch of people who financially benefit from marine reserves.	All	All		Option 4
Closing areas increases pressure on other areas. I won't benefit.				Option 4
Area not adequately defined.				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
I believe there are other options, don't think banning recreational fishing will make any difference, problem lies in many factors e.g. siltation, need proper scientific research to show there is a need for a no-take policy. Recreational fishing is a public right & should be given priority over commercial fishing.				Option 4
Recreational fishing - marine reserves deny this, use lower bag limits instead to preserve fish stocks.				Option 4
Losing my right to fish for food. Remove all commercial fishing from within 12 miles of NZ coast instead. This will negate the need for marine reserves.				Option 4
It will infringe on my rights.				Option 4
Question is too open & DOC cannot be trusted as they lie about the support they have at the Barrier. I won't benefit. Lack of a proper consultative process.	All			Option 4
Open-ended question.				Option 4
Question is too vague & don't agree that DOC can sell commercial concessions in a marine reserve.				Option 4
Against my opinion of usage of this area. Need rationale for establishment of marine reserves.	All	All		Option 4
Because it reduces possible areas for recreational fishing. Close fishing grounds further out to sea instead or ban trawlers within NZ coastal waters. I won't benefit from this reserve.				Option 4
Area proposed is too big & would prevent many people from enjoying recreational fishing.				Option 4
Leave it alone as it will prevent people from fishing & diving in area.				Option 4
Unneeded, no benefit.				Option 4
Too many activities are excluded. No benefit.				Option 4

1141	29.06.03	Henderson	Auckland	Manukau Sports Fishing Club (records officer)				Y			O			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1142	29.06.03	Hillcrest	Auckland	Outdoor Recreation NZ Party (council member)				Y			OC			1			1				N	OO
1143	29.06.03	Howick	Auckland	Ngati Kahu				Y			OC	1		1						1	N	OO
1144	29.06.03		Auckland			Y					OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1145	29.06.03		Whangarei					Y			OC			1	1					1	N	OO
1146	29.06.03	Glendene	Auckland					Y			OC			1						1	N	OO
1147	29.06.03		Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1148	24.06.03	Hillsborough	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1					1	N	OO
1149	29.06.03		Westport	Outdoor Recreation NZ Party (member)					Y		N									1	N	OO
1150	29.06.03	Ohaupo	Hamilton				Y				OC			1		1				1	N	OO
1151	29.06.03		Te Awamutu			Y					OC			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1152	29.06.03	Kumeu	Auckland				Y				O			1	1					1	N	OO
1153	29.06.03	Manly	Auckland				Y				OC			1			1			1	N	OO
1154	29.06.03	Hatfields Beach	Auckland				Y				OC			1			1			1	N	OO
1155	29.06.03	Urenui	New Plymouth	Urenui Boat Club (Committee member)				Y			OC			1		1				1	N	OO
1156	29.06.03	West Harbour	Auckland				Y				OC			1		1				1	N	OO
1157	29.06.03	Medlands	Great Barrier Is				Y				OC		1	1	1					1	N	OO
1158	29.06.03		Hamilton				Y				O			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1159	29.06.03	RD3	Wellsford				Y				OC			1						1	Y	QO
1160	29.06.03	Herald Island	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1					1	N	OO
1161	29.06.03	Manurewa	Auckland				Y				OC			1			1			1	N	OO

Lack of scientific evidence. I will not benefit at all. While random implementation of marine reserves goes on you will never get my support. DOC & Forest & Bird seem to be intent on taking control of the peoples' resources for no obvious reason. If fish are under pressure, use Ministry of Fisheries regulations to reduce quota or ban the taking of species from time to time. Reserves are permanent & I cannot condone locking up my children's & their children's resources forever, especially when it is not required.	All	All		Option 4
As yet marine reserves have not proven scientifically to aid the breeding process of or to improve fish stocks within reserve areas. DOC seems too willing to close of large areas of recreational use.				Option 4
No benefit, it is fine as it is.				Option 4
I would support a reserve if every New Zealander who wanted to make a submission was given a fair opportunity to do so. In addition, all interest groups should be given an opportunity to engage in constructive consultation.	All	All		Option 4
Recreational use will be restricted. Area should be protected by commonsense & cooperation.				Option 4
Not enough information available for a decision to be made. Questions are misleading. Best information to date believes the fishery is in good condition. DOC trying to force proposal through without proper consultation.				Option 4
I don't believe effects have been studied fully nor has the public been consulted fully.				Option 4
There does not seem sufficient cause shown to warrant it.	All	All		Option 4
I don't support the principle that locking up areas is in the best interest of our ecology or tourism industry. I live in an area where most of our traditional industries, including fishing, are either gone or under threat to make way for DOC reserves.				Option 4
Our coast is for everyone to use freely.				Option 4
Because it is a safe area when sea conditions will not allow fishing elsewhere. Easterly winds prevent us from taking many fish except on rare occasions.		All		Option 4
It would serve no useful purpose. Neither myself or any other person would receive any material benefit. There is no proven scientific benefit for having marine reserves. What mandate does the government have to impose marine reserves on the people of NZ?	All	All		Option 4
Unnecessary. Weather isolates area so there is little pressure.		All		Option 4
Not needed as area gets very little fishing pressure.		All		Option 4
Premises used to justify this and other reserves are false - this is perfectly clear to all well informed people. Need protection only from illegal and commercial fishermen. DOC should be looking after NZ for the benefit of New Zealanders, not make it illegal for people to enjoy our birthrights. The DOC machine is out of control.	All	All		Option 4
Restricts my freedom to fish in the sheltered waters off the north coast. Quota management systems are supposed to control fish stocks not restricting areas where the public can fish in safety. I cannot see any benefit in this proposal. The proposal area is good to fish for pelagic species. Closing off this area will mean I have to fish in more exposed areas, which will put me and my crew in danger. Cut back on the commercial quota if you want more fish in the ocean. DOC & the Greens need to listen to the public of NZ.				Option 4
The Quota Management System is the guarantor of the sustainability of the fisheries and marine environment. DOC wish to take the environment back to the nirvana of Year Zero. I would not benefit at all.	All	All		Option 4
Proposal has not been properly prepared & public have not been consulted fully. If done right the proposal would be good but I do not support it in its current shape or form. This estuary area is often a safe haven for people who may just throw a line over the side. I support the concept but oppose this application in all respects. As a regular visitor, only today (29th June) found out what DOC are trying to do without general consultation of the public.	All			Option 4
I have nothing against a marine reserve of some sort on GBI, but must have some benefit to the people who use the area regularly. As a government department DOC should consult with the public before a submission not after.				Option 4
Generally supportive of reserves but restrictions excessive and area too large.				Option 4
Want the Barrier left as it is.				Option 4

1162	29.06.03		Matamata					Y			OC			1	1		1					N	OO
1163	29.06.03	Whitianga	Coromandel					Y			O			1	1	1	1			1		N	OO
1164	29.06.03	Te Atatu South	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1					1		N	OO
1165	29.06.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland					Y			OC			1			1			1		N	OO
1166	29.06.03	Howick	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1				1		N	OO
1167	29.06.03	St Johns	Auckland					Y			OC			1			1			1		N	OO
1168	29.06.03	Flaxton	Kaiapoi					Y			OC			1	1					1		N	OO
1169	29.06.03		Whangarei					Y			OC			1	1					1		Not given	OO
1170	29.06.03	Grey Lynn	Auckland					Y			OC				1		1	1		1		Not given	OO
1171	29.06.03		Westport						Y		N									1		N	OO
1172	28.06.03	Epsom	Auckland					Y			OC			1						1		N	OO
1173	28.06.03	Paihia	Bay of Islands						Y		OC	1		1	1		1			1		N	OO
1174	28.06.03	Beachlands 1705	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1					1		Y	S
1175	28.06.03	Beachlands 1706	Auckland					Y			OC			1						1		Y	QS
1176	28.06.03	Beachlands 1706	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1					1		Y	QS
1177	28.06.03	Stanmore Bay	Auckland					Y			OC			1			1			1		N	OO

No accurate scientific reason for having reserve. My research shows I will not benefit. There is ample proof, well documented, that marine reserves do not improve fish stocks overall. The increased pressure on areas outside the reserve more than negates any gain that may be produced within a reserve. The policing of existing regulations would be of far greater benefit, pollution and over fishing by commercial sector is the main problem. The marine environment not the same as land and cannot be managed in a similar fashion.	All	All		Option 4
None provided.				Option 4
There are no benefits. Stop trying to exclude sections of the community from access.	All	All		Option 4
No scientific evidence has been put forward to justify such a reserve. No evidence for any benefits to myself or others.		All		Option 4
Have a small boat and only get to Barrier occasionally & often need to shelter in various places on this coast & like to fish and make the most of it while we are there.				Option 4
Want freedom to fish and travel where I want. I don't think I will benefit at all. All areas not already allocated to a marine reserve should be left that way. Remove all commercial fishing from all coastal waters within 12 miles. Proper analysis of the marine reserves already in place needs to take place to establish if any benefit has been gained to fish stocks in the areas.		All		Option 4
Makes better sense to have reduced catch limits than remove all use.				Option 4
Question regarding support is a biased question. I will not benefit from a reserve as it will ban the recreational activity of my choice. The estuary should be a mataitai. More flexible management options than marine reserves should be used over the whole area. Where is the scientific study comparing the closed Navy area with the rest of the north east coast? DOC must prove benefits before shutting off coast to all fishing. What scientific study is proposed that justifies the establishment of such a large area and that can't be done with limited recreational fishing?	All as a mataitai			Option 4
Concerned by lack of public consultation & minimal advertising of the proposal by DOC. I am concerned that the advertising has had to have been done by Option 4, who are not taxpayer funded. As Option 4 has done DOC's job, DOC should refund the money to them & start process again - this time with full information to the public. This is an issue for all New Zealanders, not just GBI residents. DOC is trying to push through a project with minimal public support - these tactics appear dishonourable for a government department.				Option 4
DOC has enough land now not generating any income for the country. I am interested in this test case on the Barrier after what DOC has done on the West Coast. DOC has done enough to smother progress in our area - where next?				Option 4
No benefit to me at all. The area should allow recreational fishing but ban commercial fishing. If a reserve is to be established, the voice of Aucklanders should be heard because we are affected too. We are one of the stakeholders. The policy should be pursued only if it fits the greater good. I see no damage to the environment at the present state of use of this area. If protecting our fish is the sole objective, then ban commercial fishing. In no way can recreational fishing be compared to commercial fishing in depleting fish stocks. Snapper is sold too cheap to overseas buyers.				Option 4
Our involvement is through charter fishing for our living. The proposal area is the main shelter in south west winds. The reserve will only increase pressure in other areas which is not beneficial. If you want to bring back fish life, you need tighter fishing quotas not marine reserves. Marine reserves do not work in huge areas. DOC should not be a decider on marine reserves as they have a biased opinion on the matter - it should be an independent body or voted by the public.	All	All		Option 4
Will produce more types of fish. Small reserves are good. Good to have reserves in different places around NZ.				Option 4
Does it have to be so big? Control commercial fishing and there will never be a lack of fish. Massive marine reserves are a bad idea, as are mussel farms at GBI.				Option 4
Too big, an area the size of Goat Island works okay, this one vast in comparison. Government departments are supposed to be transparent, with huge changes proposed better publicity is needed so that the intentions of the proponent are made clear to affected users.				Option 4
Not needed as it gets very little fishing pressure. I am a law abiding citizen, especially in relation to fisheries regulations.				Option 4

1178	28.06.03	Parnell	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1				1	N	OO
1179	28.06.03	RD2	Albany				Y			OC			1	1	1			1	Y	QS
1180	28.06.03	Blockhouse Bay	Auckland						Y	N								1	N	OO
1181	28.06.03	Milford	Auckland				Y			OC			1		1			1	N	OO
1182	28.06.03	St Heliers	Auckland			Y				O			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1183	28.06.03		Owhango	Taumarunui Rod & Rifle Club (Member)			Y			OC			1					1	N	OO
1184	28.06.03	Ngaio	Wellington						Y	N								1	N	OO
1185	28.06.03	RD 1	Whitianga				Y			O			1	1	1	1		1	Y	QS
1186	28.06.03	RD4 Albany	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1		1		1	N	OO
1187	28.06.03	RD2 Albany	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1				1	N	OO
1188	28.06.03	Papakura	Auckland				Y			OC			1					1	N	OO
1189	28.06.03		Ohope				Y			OC			1		1			1	N	OO
1190	28.06.03		Whangamata				Y			OC			1	1				1	Y	QS
1191	28.06.03	RD5	Papakura				Y			O			1		1			1	Y	QO
1192	28.06.03		Papakura				Y			N								1	Y	QS
1193	28.06.03	Manurewa	Auckland				Y			O			1	1	1			1	N	OO
1194	28.06.03		Whangamata	Te Ra Charters (Technical advisor)			Y			O	1		1	1	1		1	1	Y	QS
1195	28.06.03	Hauraki Plains	Paeroa				Y			OC			1					1	N	OO
1196	28.06.03	Army Bay	Auckland				Y			OC			1					1	N	OO

Unnecessary - a marine reserve is not needed. Address and enforce existing legislation instead. Dispersed recreational fishing better than concentrations arbitrarily defined.				Option 4
Marine reserves in place in a limited, controlled area can preserve the marine environment to everyone's advantage. The proposed area is too large - limited areas such as at Leigh can be just as effective in preserving the environment. The due process, including full consultation in an open & participative way, must be followed. This is not the case here.				Option 4
Not enough research has been done. Proper research must be done before any ad hoc proposals are made for marine reserves/parks. Overall I think marine reserves are beneficial but a scientific approach must be used.				Option 4
Prefer to see our waters round the whole of NZ to be protected from foreign fishing vessels, which fish to close to coastal areas.				Option 4
Reserve not necessary. Questions area loaded and not a balanced view.				Option 4
No proven benefits, need to address issues such as pollution. DOC is becoming too heavily driven by Forest & Bird who represent one radical, ideological & often unrealistic viewpoint of environmentalism. This influence needs to be addressed.				Option 4
I oppose the arrogance of prescribed purpose. Recreational & food harvesting types of fishing should be fixed by stopping the commercial exploitation of the fisheries. Eliminate all commercial fishing within 10 miles from the shore. Ensure rules are properly policed with harsh penalties. The whole fishing industry is corrupt. Solve the criminal abuse of resources first then consider reserves. Reserves of special interest are fine but to think that reserves preserve fish & marine stocks is just stupid.		All		Option 4
Support the idea but there must be areas where visiting boats can fish. Exclude area around Arid Island & Harotaonga.		Areas 5 & Harotaonga (part of 4).		Option 4
Unnecessary and restrictive, no benefit, leave as is.	All	All		Option 4
So as to continue current activities in area.				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
Increase population of fish for food for their families. Exclude northern end of estuary as it is a safe anchorage. I do not believe such a large area needs to be made a reserve to the complete exclusion of ordinary members of boating public. A good idea but too large.	Part			Option 4
I am not against marine reserves but the size of this proposal is far too large for this area & the lack of honest consultation is alarming.				Option 4
The recreational & commercial fishers need to be got on side - show them how they can benefit with proof of gains. Consult, not dictate when it is obvious there are other ways that will work. Compromise & discuss. Adjust both commercial & recreational quotas to take pressure off.				Option 4
No need now or in the future. No benefit. It is about time the little dictators listened to the public.				Option 4
Minimal increase in eco-tourism. Exclude estuary as it is a sheltered anchorage & policing infringements would be unrealistic. Exclude those areas with ecosystems substantially duplicated in areas that are more easily accessible. Also exclude sheltered & recognised anchorages as you need to ensure that safety is not jeopardised. There is no identifiable justification for a reserve of the proposed size but a reduced size encompassed by a restricted fishing area as in Mayor Island would be okay.	All			Option 4
Unnecessary and complicated procedure - one law could cover everyone e.g. a catch limit that is sustainable right around the coast. Take away commercial fishing from coastal areas. Ownership based on race is apartheid. DOC has too much power & authority. Individuals from DOC mislead the public. DOC misrepresents the facts to suit their ends.		All		Option 4
You can only access the area occasionally so it acts like a reserve already. I wouldn't benefit.				Option 4

1197	28.06.03	Milford	Auckland	Smokin Reels Fishing Charters (Director-Skipper)				Y			OC								1	N	OO				
1198	28.06.03	Sunnybrook	Rotorua					Y			OC								1	N	OO				
1199	28.06.03	Henderson	Auckland							Y	N								1	N	OO				
1200	28.06.03		Rotorua					Y			OC								1	N	OO				
1201	28.06.03	Stanmore Bay	Auckland					Y			O								1	1	1	1	1	N	OO
1202	28.06.03	Swanson	Auckland					Y			O								1	1	1			N	OO
1203	28.06.03		Te Anau					Y			OC								1					N	OO
1204	27.06.03	Beachlands	Auckland					Y			OC								1	1	1	1		Y	QO
1205	27.06.03	Manurewa	Auckland					Y			OC								1	1	1			N	OO
1206	27.06.03		Cambridge							Y	N								1				1	N	OO
1207	27.06.03	Glenfield	Auckland					Y			OC								1					N	OO
1208	27.06.03		New Plymouth					Y			OC								1				1	N	OO
1209	27.06.03	Ohauti 3001	Tauranga	ORNZ (Committee member)				Y			OC								1	1	1			N	OO
1210	27.06.03	Avondale	Auckland					Y			O								1		1			N	OO
1211	27.06.03	RD Mahoenui	New Plymouth					Y			OC								1	1			1	N	OO
1212	27.06.03	Green Island	Dunedin							Y	N								1				1	Y	S
1213	27.06.03		Dargaville					Y											1	1			1	Y	QS

Do not support proposal because DOC keep a low profile when this & other proposed marine reserves are around. It is our right as New Zealanders to go fishing. DOC are trying to push these issues through too fast, without enough thought. Why do they want a reserve, what is the risk & how can it be eliminated? More time is needed to look into these issues & to look at all areas & all parties are well informed & agree that this is the only way to proceed. It is an isolated area & I doubt if it gets fished anyway. Listen to the people who are directly affected.		All		Option 4
There are enough "no go" areas as it is. I will not benefit - in fact the opposite. Any marine reserves should apply to commercial fishermen only. It is our heritage we are talking about here.		All		Option 4
The area is not under threat of over-usage. Questions are unclear. If any reserve is established the benefits should be in the best interests of the users, not locked away only for the benefit of a handful of people. The proposed size is outrageous - it restricts workers from their workplace & the public from catching a fish which is managed by the quota system. Was there any study conducted into the area to establish the need for a reserve? The area looks after itself as it has done for thousands of years. If DOC are concerned about the fish then take a look at the overseas fishing vessels.				Option 4
Lack of proper public consultation and majority of island residents are opposed to it. I believe DOC has targeted know support groups seeking their known support for this proposal. It is obvious DOC has a hidden agenda & is not disclosing all of its proposals for marine reserves around NZ's coastline. Public submissions should be sorted, collected & reported on by some organisation that we can trust.		All		Option 4
None given.				Option 4
Marine reserves appear to have no benefit or reasons in aiding recovery of replenishing of fish stocks. Of what benefit is this or any other marine reserve proposal? I believe we need to research into controlled breeding farming. We need to stop commercial rapping of sea. DOC needs to look harder at the real reason for fish stock depletion & do things such as regulating fishing during spawning seasons.	All	All		Option 4
The support question is ambiguous. Marine reserves should not be made in areas that NZ people regularly use for recreational fishing. The local population should be fully consulted & the majority should rule.				Option 4
Proposed area is too large & backs the navy area effectively rendering entire east coast area un-fishable. It also leaves no shelter for boats in westerly winds. Please consider a more moderate area.				Option 4
DOC are too arrogant & only care about themselves. The Maori & others have to much to say already.				Option 4
We are being inundated with reserve proposals & it's time there was some scientific evidence given as to the need for reserves. We don't need marine reserves as the government already has the tools & resources to protect the marine ecosystem without the need for further protection. How will DOC manage the reserve? What benefits are there to the recreational angler?	All			Option 4
Marine life is not at risk. I don't think I will benefit from the reserve. No areas should be protected as only areas easily accessible to immigrants are at risk & in those areas the shellfish only is at risk. This proposal is not required & would have limited value to 99% of New Zealanders. The system seems bend on creating marine reserves which are too broad in their restrictions & too large in size. More policing of current regulations is needed. More education for users of the ocean is needed. Do not punish recreational fishers.	All	All		Option 4
The ecosystem is not under threat. Other fisheries management is sufficient. The sea has sustained mankind for millennia & can do so in future as long as we make wise use of its resources. Locking up areas without justification is against good conservation practice & against resource management of Maori. DOC just wants to extend its operation beyond the coast. DOC should work with Ministry of Fisheries for the better management of our marine resources. If protecting fish is the object then protect fish during spawning.		All		Option 4
Area has not been subject to study. Just another DOC scam to deprive people of their rights. We already have 3000 sq km of de facto reserves.		All		Option 4
Not needed, fish stocks are better than ever as quota system works well. Reserves will put more pressure on non-reserve areas. Marine area is the Ministry of Fisheries job, not DOC's.				Option 4
Marine reserves are not in best interests of recreational fishers & are of no benefit to me. I am frequent user of the estuary so oppose any part of it being in reserve.	All	All		Option 4
Support proposal if everyone has input into location & size. Reserve would improve fish stocks.				Option 4
Qualified support - not sure of benefits until see some data.				Option 4

1214	25.06.03	RD1	Tauranga				Y		OC			1					1	N	OO
1215	25.06.03		New Plymouth				Y		OC			1					1	N	OO
1216	22.08.03	Clevedon	RD5 Papakura	Clevedon Cruising Club (Member)			Y		O			1	1	1	1			N	OO
1217	25.06.03	Albany	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1	1	1		1	Y	QS
1218	25.06.03	Army Bay	Auckland				Y		OC			1		1	1		1	N	QO
1219	25.06.03	Pauanui Beach	Coromandel				Y		O			1	1		1		1	N	QO
1220	25.06.03		Tauranga					Y	N								1	N	OO
1221	25.06.03	Manly Beach	Whangaparaoa			Y			OC			1		1			1	N	OO
1222	25.06.03	Browns Bay	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1	1			1	N	QO
1223	25.06.03	Tindalls Bay	Whangaparaoa	Tiritiri Action Group (member)				Y	O	1		1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1224	25.06.03	Tindalls Bay	Whangaparaoa				Y		OC			1			1	1	1	N	OO
1225	25.06.03	West Harbour	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1226	25.06.03		Hamilton				Y		OC			1	1				1	N	OO
1227	25.06.03	Stanmore Bay	Whangaparaoa				Y		O			1	1	1			1	N	OO
1228	25.06.03	Manly	Whangaparaoa				Y		OC			1			1		1	N	OO
1229	25.06.03	Gulf Harbour	Auckland		Y				O			1			1		1	Y	QO
1230	25.06.03	Hatfields Beach	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1	1	1		1	Y	QS
1231	25.06.03		Auckland				Y		OC			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1232	25.06.03	Onehunga	Auckland	Ngtea Pama			Y		O	1		1		1			1	N	OO
1233	25.06.03	Mission Bay	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1				1	N	OO
1234	25.06.03	Mairangi Bay	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1				1	N	OO
1235	25.06.03	RD1	Te Aroha				Y		OC			1		1	1		1	N	OO
1236	25.06.03		Auckland				Y		OC			1					1	N	OO
1237	25.06.03		Auckland				Y		OC			1			1		1	Y	QO

Don't believe no-take reserves help the fishery or the environment. I won't benefit.				Option 4
No proper research done.				Option 4
I have fished, looked & dived the area for 30 years & regard it as a prime recreational spot, a jewel. The reserve will cause a loss of access to area for fishing, diving & game fishing. This area is isolated & beautiful which to me as a fisher or holiday-maker is great - it should remain available to all sports & all people.		All		Yes
Strongly urge DOC to undertake consultation. Support concept of marine reserves provided sufficient info is provided to justify & sustain ongoing benefits. Partial areas for fishing & other recreational activities should be retained in area of interest.				Option 4
A reasonable size, say 10ha, may have inspired me to support it.				Option 4
Not a big reserve, a small one would be okay. Would not benefit from a large reserve. I would like to attend a meeting in Auckland to discuss various options.				Option 4
We will not benefit.				Option 4
Area is so remote & exposed that it is inaccessible most of the time. Marine reserves are for the purpose of stock replenishment, scientific study & sightseeing but there is no run down of stocks, scientific research can take place without a reserve, sightseeing already takes place. As a property owner on northern GBI it is distressing that I am not able to hear DOC explain the proposal.				Option 4
Do not support principle due to proposed size, I do agree with smaller reserves. Commercial fishing should be banned within at least 30 miles of NZ coast. At same time, recreational fishers catch could be reduced to protect fishery all around NZ.				Option 4
This is a continuing cancer that is eating away at coastal recreational fisheries which will not be satisfied until entire coastline of NZ is under this type of control. Any proposals of marine reserves by DOC should be subject to a full & open consultative process with all interested & affected people & should incorporate a format for all future proposals so there is a coordinated working model against which future proposals can be gauged & evaluated.				Option 4
Recreational fishers will end up with nowhere to fish with their kids. Too many proposals. Reduce commercial fishing instead. At what cost policing a reserve where there are not enough police in Auckland? Has there been any studies on commercial vs. recreational fishing? We agree with conservation but it must be in balance with what is a NZ way of life.				Option 4
Makes it inaccessible for boats to enjoy. Area not always accessible due to weather. We just want to be able to anchor overnight & enjoy wonderful area.				Option 4
It will reduce recreational fishing.		All		Option 4
It is only in recent years that my family & I have been able to access this area due to better & larger boats so to spend time fishing & diving in this area is regarded by us as bonus. Any proposal should have first had extensive research into the viability of a reserve & whether the particular area proposed will encourage increased marine life that will overflow into surrounding areas. I don't believe this will occur in this area & have seen no evidence of such research.		All		Option 4
Under limited pressure & should be available for everyone's use. There is a need to listen to concerns that those who use proposed marine reserves have.				Option 4
I have answered all the questions I am interested in.				Option 4
Reduce the size.				Option 4
None given.				Option 4
It will restrict one of best areas in Hauraki Gulf. Do not protect areas 3,4,5,6,7, & 8.		Areas 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8.		Option 4
For recreational fishing. No benefit.				Option 4
Does not support area proposed.				Option 4
Easy accessibility to recreational anglers is being denied. Take into account all reserves and other no-take areas and there are already enough marine reserves to sustain our fishing resource.	All	All		Option 4
Not as currently proposed. A better answer would be to ban commercial fishing from NZ's coastline & police recreational fishing regulations.				Option 4
Does not support area proposed.				Option 4

1238	24.06.03		Hamilton				Y		OC			1			1		1	N	OO
1239	24.06.03	Meadowbank	Auckland				Y		OC			1			1		1	N	OO
1240	24.06.03	Rothsay Bay	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1241	24.06.03		Whangarei				Y		OC			1					1	N	OO
1242	24.06.03	Wattle Downs	Manukau				Y		OC			1	1		1		1	N	OO
1243	24.06.03	Epsom	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1244	24.06.03	Bell Block	New Plymouth					Y	N								1	Not given	Not given
1245	24.06.03	Rukuhia	Hamilton				Y		OC			1		1			1	N	OO
1246	24.06.03	Ohiwa Harbour	Ohope				Y		O			1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1247	24.06.03	New Lynn	Auckland	Manukau Sports Fishing Club (Club captain)			Y		O	1		1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1248	24.06.03	Henderson	Auckland				Y		OC						1		1	N	OO
1249	24.06.03	Laingholm	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1	1			1	N	OO
1250	24.06.03	Browns Bay	Auckland				Y		OC			1		1			1	N	OO
1251	24.06.03	Greenbay	Auckland				Y		OC			1					1	N	OO
1252	24.06.03	Beachhaven	Auckland				Y		N									N	OO
1253	24.06.03	Mt Roskill	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1				1	N	OO
1254	24.06.03	RD3	Pokeno 1872				Y		OC			1		1			1	Y	OO

I don't want recreational fishing spots to be affected. I don't think I will benefit.				Option 4
I believe in freedom to pursue rights to fish. There are already enough marine reserves. I am against restrictions on my basic rights to enjoy NZ & its coastal waters - next you will be giving away rights to the foreshore & seabed.		All		Option 4
Don't see the need for one in this location. Why do all the recent marine reserve proposals seem to creep up from behind? And give the general public little, if any, advance information about it?				Option 4
Already enough reserves. I won't benefit.		All		Option 4
Do marine reserves really work?	All	All		Option 4
Overall concept for NZ coastline is too haphazard. Needs to be a cohesive approach will all areas looked at & researched at same time. Soon there will be nowhere for recreational boats to go & it's our country too. Area there any eco-tourism companies, existing or future, that will stand to benefit to the detriment of every day New Zealanders who use these areas now? If these reserves happen, where am I going to be able to take my children fishing?				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
It is abusing my right to fish in this area. Don't want any reserves anywhere ever. I have the born right to fish & gather seafood anywhere on the coastline of NZ, abiding by the local bylaws & fishing regulations.	All	All		Option 4
Insufficient data to suggest the need for one in this area. Too far removed from large population base to give any benefit to general public. No benefit to me, instead a liability as my activity will be restricted to cruising only. Proposal is based on dodgy premises. The majority of community affected do not support it. Public consultation has been almost non-existent so what mandate does DOC claim to have to establish such a reserve? DOC wants 10% marine reserves by 2010 - if all reserves & no-fish zones area taken then we already have close to this.	All			Option 4
Not required & no scientific evidence to support the need for it. No consultation with fishers & no public meetings in Auckland. DOC has an agenda above their station. DOC should be removed from the process due to its fixed agenda.	All	All		Option 4
There appears no mechanism for such a designation to be revisited or revoked. Insufficient safeguards in shape of public accountability & access. There is too much scope for vested interests to manipulate control of the area. An area with a smaller & enforced bag limit could do a lot of good but a total exclusion zone is too open to abuse. If the purpose is scientific research, why is such a large area required? What criteria were used to choose this area?				Option 4
Don't need it, can't see any benefit. What justification is there for a reserve other than to limit human activity in the area & prevent people from enjoying themselves? If the purpose is to conserve fish stocks, ban commercial fishing or at least police it.				Option 4
Unique and favourite fishing destination, surely there are other areas that can be considered? Wouldn't lowering daily bag and size limits have a more beneficial impact than the establishment of more reserves?	All	All		Option 4
The fishing is currently excellent, why do you need further reserves? I understand the Poor Knights reserve has attracted snapper but this year I have noticed an improvement in fishing generally - is this improvement due to a general improvement or is it due to the marine reserve? How come snapper have increased in the Poor Knights when they were not a target species previously?				Option 4
Complete lack of scientific justification. Prior to establishment, academic research is needed to show it will improve reproductive recruitment of specific species across a broad region, not just the reserve area, or that the reserve is essential to a species' well-being.		All		Option 4
Fishing there is too good and it is a popular fishing spot and the island will lose visitors. There are no benefits. Do not include the estuary as it is a family playground. How will the reserve be secure from local iwi & Maori fishing rights?	All	All		Option 4
There should be no reserves anywhere because all they do is put pressure on non-reserve areas. If Ministry of Fisheries were managing the quota system properly & keeping large commercial fishing boats out of inshore fisheries, there would be no problem.				Option 4

1255	24.06.03	Whangaparaoa	Auckland					Y										OC				1			1					1	Y	QS
1256	24.06.03	Papakura 1703	Auckland					Y										OC				1								1	N	OO
1257	24.06.03	Murrays Bay	Auckland					Y										O				1		1						1	N	OO
1258	24.06.03	Mission Bay	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1							1	N	OO
1259	24.06.03	Titirangi	Auckland					Y										OC												1	N	OO
1260	24.06.03	New Lynn	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1		1					1	N	OO
1261	24.06.03	Manly	Whangaparaoa					Y										O												1	N	OO
1262	24.06.03	Glenfield	Auckland					Y										OC				1								1	Y	QO
1263	24.06.03	Lynfield	Auckland					Y										OC	1			1			1					1	N	QO
1264	24.06.03	Stanmore Bay	Whangaparaoa					Y										O				1	1		1					1	N	OO
1265	24.06.03	Torbay	Auckland														Y	N				1	1							1	N	OO
1266	24.06.03	Blockhouse Bay	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1	1	1					1	N	OO
1267	24.06.03	Kohimarama	Auckland					Y										OC				1								1	N	OO
1268	24.06.03	Manly	Auckland					Y										OC				1								1	Y	QS
1269	22.08.03	Torbay	Auckland					Y										O				1		1							N	OO
1270	24.06.03		Gisbourne					Y										OC				1								1	N	OO
1271	24.06.03	Albany	Auckland					Y										OC				1								1	N	OO
1272	24.06.03	Albany	Auckland					Y										OC				1								1	N	OO
1273	24.06.03	Red Beach	Orewa	Hibiscus Coast Boating Club (member)				Y										OC				1	1		1					1	Y	QO

Good snorkeling and diving. The underhand way that DOC proposes these reserves with little or no public comment or consultation is deplorable & this proposal should be stopped & a new proposal submitted following proper and fair guidelines. It seems that there is a policy to announce these reserves over the Christmas/New Year period when most people are busy & this is a way to sneak these reserves through unchallenged.				Option 4
Only light fishing in area, controlled take is a better option. We have good practice e.g. 1 kingfish over 1 metre long per person. The area is self policing - I would welcome more control on take instead of a reserve. Recreational fishers seem to be a target for no valid reason. Even the large amounts of fish taken in fishing competitions does not compare to the amount taken by commercial trawlers. I am happy to increase the minimum size of snapper I am allowed to take.		All		Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
Keep open for recreational use				Option 4
More research is needed rather than just a reaction to DOC's need to fulfill its existence. Just because this area is seldom visited, there is no reason to propose a reserve. A reserve would hopefully enhance recreational fishing.		All		Option 4
Marine reserves are not needed. Marine parks and proper policing of any legislations are all that is needed. I would not benefit as there is no land access to these areas anyway. There is no advantage in making these areas reserve, just impose certain restrictions & make marine parks.				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
I don't think I will benefit. The coastline & up to 5 nautical miles should not be in a reserve, allowing recreational fishers to fish from the shore or in small vessels. I think the pendulum has swung too far with marine reserves. There are too many restrictions being placed on recreational fishers, when the effort should be placed on policing commercial or illegal fishing.		Coastline & area out to 5nm.		Option 4
Would agree to a much smaller proposal (say 10 hectares). The benefits of marine reserves are proven at places like Goat Island & Tawharanui. Unsure about actual proposal - asks question about whether all fishing will be excluded. This area is a good place for a smaller reserve closer inshore.				Option 4
This is a favourite family spot which we have enjoyed for years & my children should have the right to also enjoy for years.	All	All		Option 4
"Somewhere" opens too many options for DOC. If a marine reserve is considered necessary why must it be in an area that the boating public regularly use? Research and conservation can surely be carried out in areas not normally accessible to the public. DOC lies in press releases about the level of support.				Option 4
No need, fishing is great. A permanent commercial fishing ban on the inner Waitemata Harbour would be fine. Recreational fishing should be allowed anywhere along the coast. The current recreational quotas work fine. Restricting commercial fishing from this area would be acceptable.	All			Option 4
Not necessary. I can't benefit.				Option 4
Benefits are protection of part of the marine flora & fauna. There is too much haste & not enough consultation, transparency or publicity of proposals.				Option 4
It encroaches our prime recreational fishing area & is an infringement on our rights as New Zealanders. The area is normally protected by climatic conditions & a reserve here is not necessary or accepted by the public who utilise it. Not one will benefit. Consider instead an area not subjected to so many keen anglers & visitors.	All	All		Yes
Need for an overall approach. A NZ-wide study should be undertaken.				Option 4
No proof it will enhance the area's marine environment. I don't like the misleading way DOC try to get reserves into place. Have the reserves DOC has on GBI improved in any way? Why can't DOC make the reserves where the cable areas & Navy areas are?				Option 4
No proof it will enhance the area's marine environment. I don't like the misleading way DOC try to get reserves into place. Have the reserves DOC has on GBI improved in any way? Why can't DOC make the reserves where the cable areas & Navy areas are?				Option 4
Area definitely needs protection from commercial fishermen but not recreational. Who has asked for this and why is it not advertised more openly? Need to let parents teach kids by example, not exclude them.				Option 4

1274	24.06.03	Maraetai Beach	Auckland					Y										O				1	1	1	1			1	Y	QS
1275	24.06.03	Torbay	Auckland					Y										O				1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1276	24.06.03	Wellesley St	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1		1			1	N	OO
1277	24.06.03	Glenfield	Auckland					Y										O				1	1					1	N	OO
1278	24.06.03	RD 1 Waimauku	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1279	24.06.03	Manurewa	Auckland					Y										OC				1		1	1			1	N	OO
1280	24.06.03	Epsom	Auckland					Y										OC				1						1	N	OO
1281	24.06.03	Browns Bay	Auckland					Y										OC				1		1				1	N	OO
1282	24.06.03	Stanmore Bay	Whangaparaoa							Y								OC				1						1	N	OO
1283	24.06.03	Mairangi Bay	Auckland					Y										OC				1						1	N	OO
1284	24.06.03	Birkdale	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1					1	N	OO
1285	24.06.03	Mangere East	Auckland					Y										OC				1		1				1	N	OO
1286	24.06.03	Gulf Harbour	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1					1	N	OO
1287	24.06.03	Hillcrest	Hamilton							Y								N											N	OO
1288	24.06.03	Woodhill	Auckland					Y										OC				1						1	N	OO
1289	24.06.03	Howick	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1290	24.06.03	Sunnyvale	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1		1			1	N	OO
1291	24.06.03	Albany	Auckland					Y										OC				1		1				1	Y	QS
1292	24.06.03	Ponsonby	Auckland					Y										OC				1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1293	24.06.03	Howick	Auckland	Furuno Fishing Club (Committee member)				Y										O				1	1		1			1	N	OO

As long as the marine reserve is a sensible size it will help maintain fish stocks in and around GBI. Exclude Arid Island & surrounds & have reserve at lower end of island. I support the principle of marine reserves but only with adequate consultation with the public & as long as our freedom to fish in accessible and plentiful areas is not totally restricted. Perhaps more money should be put towards development of fish farms to ensure more plentiful stocks in years to come.		Area 5.		Option 4
The area is not over-fished - its location & remoteness make it accessible only when the weather is good - it protects itself. If you make this area a marine reserve you may end up killing someone by denying them the safe anchorages e.g. Harotaonga, Rakitu Cove, Korotiti.				Option 4
I see no need for a marine reserve in this area. I won't benefit.	All	All		Option 4
Recreational fishing around Auckland needs as much space as possible. Marine life needs to be protected in the Auckland area by banning commercial fishing & policing existing catch limits and regulations on recreational fishers. Also education.				Option 4
Conservation and protection of these areas would occur with more active policing. This would be more efficient and people friendly.				Option 4
This will lock out the people who regularly use this area for recreation & who look after the area. The vast majority of people who use this area take great care in looking after the area. Taking that away from the public is not what DOC is supposed to be about.				Option 4
Area too large & flawed philosophy. No benefit.	All			Option 4
Commercial removes 90% of fish stocks, not recreational.	All	All		Option 4
Insufficient reason for reserve. We do not think it will be of any benefit. The making of a marine reserve in this manner is contrary to the spirit of the Resource Management Act which requires the widest possible public consultation & input.				Option 4
We should be able to use the Gulf & islands as a recreational right. The real issue is to ensure the Gulf is not raped by illegal fishers & that is a policing issue which will not be solved by a no-take policy. DOC seem to think the only way to manage a resource is to exclude all humans - that is rubbish.				Option 4
I do not feel reserves are the answer - better management would achieve more. Education would do more to help the environment rather than totally banning everything & everyone.				Option 4
Not enough recreational fishers able to fish in this area to warrant a marine reserve. It should be closed to commercial fishing though. Commercial fishing should be better managed.	All	All		Option 4
Leave well alone. No benefits.	All			Option 4
Interested in all issues affecting NZ fisheries. I am concerned the issues have not been debated by a wide enough selection of interested parties for a balanced decision to be made.				Option 4
Cannot see overall benefits.	All	All		Option 4
Not needed, there are plenty of fish and wildlife, the area has inbuilt protection because it is so remote. I won't benefit, it will become the domain of elitists, do-gooders & preservationists. The area has already been well protected by current users. The earlier GBI proposal was much smaller and widely supported & now DOC are driving their own preservationist agenda.	All	All		Option 4
Not required.				Option 4
Abundant marine life for future generations, like Goat Island. Make it workable, so that small/medium recreational boaters can safely use the area, catch a fish and see the marine reserve. You need to consult with the large part of users e.g. Auckland boaters.				Option 4
Aside from commercial fishing, the area is relatively remote & unfettered access should be allowed. No personal benefit to me. NZ needs publication of strategy and policy around marine reserves rather than a piecemeal approach driven by DOC individuals. This is a government policy issue not a DOC issue.		All		Option 4
Area is self policing for recreational use. The entire area does not need protecting. Should it need to be a reserve, all recreational activity should be allowed e.g. fishing, diving etc.	All	All		Option 4

1294	24.06.03	Arkles Bay 1463	Hibiscus Coast				Y			OC		1						1	N	OO
1295	24.06.03	Te Atatu South	Auckland				Y			OC		1	1	1	1			1	Y	QO
1296	24.06.03	Gulf Harbour	Whangaparaoa				Y			OC		1	1		1			1	N	OO
1297	24.06.03	Red Beach	Orewa				Y			OC		1	1		1			1	N	OO
1298	24.06.03	Alfriston	Papakura				Y			OC		1		1	1			1	N	OO
1299	24.06.03	Roskill South	Auckland				Y			OC		1		1				1	Y	S
1300	24.06.03	Meadowbank	Auckland	Orakei Sea Scouts (First Officer)			Y			OC		1	1			1		1	Y	QS
1301	23.06.03		Wellsford	RnR Charters Ltd (CEO)					Y	O	1		1		1	1	1	1	N	OO
1302	23.06.03	Remuera	Auckland				Y			OC		1			1			1	N	QO
1303	23.06.03	St Heliers	Auckland				Y			OC		1			1			1	N	OO
1304	23.06.03		Wellsford	RnR Charters Ltd (CEO)					Y	O	1		1		1	1	1	1	N	OO
1305	23.06.03	Ellerslie	Auckland				Y			OC		1		1				1	N	OO
1306	23.06.03		Wellsford				Y			OC		1						1	N	OO
1307	23.06.03	Mt Eden	Auckland				Y			OC		1	1	1	1			1	N	OO

This would deny people fishing in wild. This is such a remote area - you have to be dedicated to get there & as such a reserve is no benefit. I think we are going overboard with reserves - what about marine parks that allow recreational fishing & a licensed system for charter boats? Making all these reserves is a hidden agenda to make a lot of scuba diving accessible from downtown Auckland & will do nothing for the people of Rodney or GBI.	All			Option 4
Not provided.				Option 4
No substantial proof that it is necessary. There will be no benefit.	All	All		Option 4
Hopelessly unnecessary. I will not benefit. NZ coast is long & our population is small so we simply do not need such ludicrous doses of bureaucratic tampering. Stop wasting taxpayer money on an idea that seems designated to infuriate normal people. There is no need to dictate vast areas of coast that are out of bounds to folk who have every god-given right to use those areas.				Option 4
The proposal appears to be a creeping form of restriction designed to strangle the rights & freedoms traditionally enjoyed by the majority of New Zealanders. I will not benefit at all. If this continues, recreational fishers will end up with only a little fish pond to fish in. If there are any restrictions they should be on the size & number of foreign vessels that plunder our resources.				Option 4
Fisheries breeding & recreational snorkeling are the benefits.				Option 4
Preservation of resources of area. Concerned that: 1) The proposed area is too large. 2) There has been minimal public consultation. 3) There have been no published scientific studies showing whether this is the right or wrong place for the reserve. Locking up the coastline just because it 'feels right' does not help the preservation of our marine species.				Option 4
No reserve is needed, no justification, weather protects area. I find this questionnaire insulting to our intelligence. I won't benefit, the sea life won't benefit. The marine reserve will protect it from what? Are you presuming there is a danger from recreational fishing? Where is the evidence of this? Why is it not possible to conduct scientific research in the area now? Where did silt in the DOC video originate from? This is solely an attempt by government to extract a dollar from the customary fisher. The government allows the wholesale slaughter of many fish by allowing huge commercial take for which they receive millions of dollars. Recreational fishers are not the cause of any perceived decline in fish stocks. Marine reserves are not needed, good husbandry of our oceans is.	All	All		Option 4
Marine reserves have greater costs than benefits due to the restrictions on private individuals. Reserves are good for areas with large local populations so people can go to them & observe a protected underwater environment free from excessive exploitation.				Option 4
Don't know where or how big it will be. There should be no marine reserve without consultation with groups representing recreational fishers (Option 4). There should be a limited introduction of marine reserves in New Zealand.				Option 4
No justification, no need, no pressure. No one will benefit, not even the marine life. Do not like the questions - you do not cease to amaze me with you lies & deviousness. Where is the scientific evidence of over fishing by recreational fishers? The area is not under pressure. Recreational fishers are being penalized while big commercial boats are raping & pillaging. The government is all for this because of money generated.	All	All		Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
As a fishing area, it allows, in the event of bad weather a choice of seeking sheltered water on either the east or the west coast on the northern end of GBI. Marine reserves are of use to the general public if they can be readily accessed. This proposal could not be readily accessed & would only be a place for the well-to-do.				Option 4
A reserve would preclude passage of any vessel with fish or fishing tackle on board which would mean many boats could no longer circumnavigate the island - a very unsafe restriction. Any area which does not have a specific and scientifically supported reason to become a reserve. This proposal is poorly researched. DOC should be serving the public interest & should stop empire building. There are adequate rules in place to protect the environment if they were policed properly. More rules does not equal better enforcement. What research has been done to justify 10% of our coastline being tied up in marine reserves?				Option 4

1308	23.06.03	Mt Eden	Auckland					Y											OC				1	1	1	1				1	N	OO	
1309	23.06.03	Mt Eden	Auckland					Y											OC				1	1	1	1				1	N	OO	
1310	23.06.03	Mt Eden	Auckland					Y											OC				1	1	1	1				1	N	OO	
1311	23.06.03	Waimauku	Auckland	Muriwai Sports Fishing Club (Member)				Y											OC				1		1					1	N	OO	
1312	23.06.03	Titirangi	Auckland	NZBGFC (Public Relations Officer)				Y											O				1		1		1				N	OO	
1313	23.06.03		Tauranga																Y	N										1	N	OO	
1314	23.06.03	Ilam	Christchurch	Option 4 (Active supporter)															Y	OC											1	N	OO
1315	23.06.03	St Andrews	Hamilton	Waikato Boating and Sportfishing Club (Committee member)				Y											OC				1							1	Y	QS	
1316	23.06.03	Longview Rd	Reporoa					Y											N											1	N	OO	
1317	23.06.03	Bellevue	Tauranga					Y											O				1	1	1	1				1	Y	QS	
1318	23.06.03	St Johns	Auckland					Y											OC				1	1	1	1				1	N	OO	
1319	23.06.03	Pukekohe 1800	Auckland					Y											OC				1		1					1	N	OO	
1320	23.06.03	St Heliers Bay	Auckland				Y												O				1	1	1	1				1	N	OO	
1321	23.06.03	Atiamuri	Taupo					Y											OC				1	1						1	N	OO	

A reserve would preclude passage of any vessel with fish or fishing tackle on board which would mean many boats could no longer circumnavigate the island - a very unsafe restriction. Any area which does not have a specific and scientifically supported reason to become a reserve. This proposal is poorly researched. DOC should be serving the public interest & should stop empire building. There are adequate rules in place to protect the environment if they were policed properly. More rules does not equal better enforcement. What research has been done to justify 10% of our coastline being tied up in marine reserves?				Option 4
A reserve would preclude passage of any vessel with fish or fishing tackle on board which would mean many boats could no longer circumnavigate the island - a very unsafe restriction. Any area which does not have a specific and scientifically supported reason to become a reserve. This proposal is poorly researched. DOC should be serving the public interest & should stop empire building. There are adequate rules in place to protect the environment if they were policed properly. More rules does not equal better enforcement. What research has been done to justify 10% of our coastline being tied up in marine reserves?				Option 4
A reserve would preclude passage of any vessel with fish or fishing tackle on board which would mean many boats could no longer circumnavigate the island - a very unsafe restriction. Any area which does not have a specific and scientifically supported reason to become a reserve. This proposal is poorly researched. DOC should be serving the public interest & should stop empire building. There are adequate rules in place to protect the environment if they were policed properly. More rules does not equal better enforcement. What research has been done to justify 10% of our coastline being tied up in marine reserves?				Option 4
The coast not under threat. This is just another case of DOC & the government picking on the public because they think they can get away with it. I support the idea of a massive protest against marine reserves which will get TV coverage. Let's keep on fishing.				Option 4
Do not support idea because I am a New Zealander and I have the right to fish for food. I will not benefit. No scientific evidence has been given as to the reasons for protection. DOC have shown they cannot be trusted & I will never support any DOC proposals in future. The lack of consultation has been a disgrace. Leave us & our rights along & enforce the laws currently in place - that will do something to protect our fishery.				Option 4
Put a reserve in outer space. Sack DOC.				Option 4
An unnecessary bureaucratic undemocratic intrusion on recreational users of the area and on individual rights. DOC should be accountable to the public.	All	All		Option 4
The proposed reserve is way larger than necessary, a much smaller area would be a better idea for everyone.				Option 4
Marine reserves have limited benefit to the general public and remove the right of all New Zealanders to harvest from the sea for their families. Management of commercial fisheries would be more productive.	All	All		Option 4
Protection of species and habitat will help ensure good fish stocks as at Leigh. The public must have reasonable access to recreational fishing from shore, otherwise they will miss out because they don't have a boat/can't afford a boat. I support marine reserves but wide public consultation must be part of process, not just lip service as demonstrated by DOC to date.		Shore areas.		Option 4
Never seen more than 20 people out there so it is totally unnecessary protection. There are other areas being hammered that should be looked at.				Option 4
I will no longer have use of an area for what I enjoy. I will not benefit. As a member of the public who uses this area, I find it unthinkable that DOC has not approached us about this proposal. Thousands of us use the area, not just GBI locals.				Option 4
This will have a negative impact on my families usage and enjoyment of the area. No benefit.				Option 4
My fundamental right as a New Zealander is to be able to partake of our outdoor recreational facilities. Nobody has the right to make a decision for me that denies me and my family from enjoying the bountiful riches that NZ has to offer. I will not benefit from my right to go fishing being taken away.		All		Option 4

1322	23.06.03	Campbells Bay	Auckland					Y												O				1			1	1					1	N	OO
1323	23.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is																														1	N	OO
1324	23.06.03	Parnell	Auckland					Y																	1	1							1	N	OO
1325	23.06.03	RD 4	Hamilton										Y												1	1	1	1					1	N	OO
1326	23.06.03	Te Atatu South	Auckland					Y																	1	1							1	N	OO
1327	23.06.03	Te Atatu South	Auckland					Y																	1	1							1	N	OO
1328	23.06.03	Te Atatu South	Auckland					Y																	1	1							1	N	OO
1329	23.06.03	Te Atatu South	Auckland					Y																	1	1							1	N	OO
1330	23.06.03	Te Atatu South	Auckland					Y																	1	1							1	N	OO
1331	23.06.03	Karori	Wellington					Y																	1	1	1	1					1	N	OO
1332	23.06.03	Orakei	Auckland					Y																	1	1	1	1					1	N	OO

We have enough. I am totally against areas being reserved in a pristine condition for others to see. If we really want to increase fish stocks, we would reduce commercial take, which is just a revenue source for the government. The proposal is so huge that I have to pass through it to get safely back to Port Fitzroy should the weather turn bad. I cannot travel through the area with fish on board. Do I take the long way around & risk life & property or do I throw my fish away & seek shelter in a marine reserve? If the government was genuine about conservation they would charge the commercial sector more for their quota & give them less of it.	All	All		Option 4
None provided.				Option 4
Because you are pushing them for no valid reason and going about it in a totally devious way e.g. mis-statements about the support you allegedly have from residents. There is no scientific, cultural or commonsense reason why there should be any reserve at all. DOC has been hijacked by fanatical interest groups such as Forest & Bird. I have no objection to reserves for specific, threatened, scientifically valuable areas but have not seen evidence of this.				Option 4
It is not necessary. More can be accomplished by putting bans on commercial seine fishing. This is nothing but an attempt to stop man going fishing. The government has made no attempt to take any catch away from Maori which is interesting. The government is in the pocket of big business, cannot be trusted & do not have the interests of the people at heart. They have hidden agendas & are prepared to ignore public submissions. Confrontation will be the result if this continues.	All			Option 4
Given the location and frequency this area is visited, it is effectively a natural reserve anyway. No benefit at all. Justify why a reserve is needed. If scientific research needs to be done, then simply do it - why does a reserve have to be created? A coordinated approach is required before selecting ad hoc areas to become marine reserves.				Option 4
Given the location and frequency this area is visited, it is effectively a natural reserve anyway. No benefit at all. Justify why a reserve is needed. If scientific research needs to be done, then simply do it - why does a reserve have to be created? A coordinated approach is required before selecting ad hoc areas to become marine reserves.				Option 4
Given the location and frequency this area is visited, it is effectively a natural reserve anyway. No benefit at all. Justify why a reserve is needed. If scientific research needs to be done, then simply do it - why does a reserve have to be created? A coordinated approach is required before selecting ad hoc areas to become marine reserves.				Option 4
Given the location and frequency this area is visited, it is effectively a natural reserve anyway. No benefit at all. Justify why a reserve is needed. If scientific research needs to be done, then simply do it - why does a reserve have to be created? A coordinated approach is required before selecting ad hoc areas to become marine reserves.				Option 4
Given the location and frequency this area is visited, it is effectively a natural reserve anyway. No benefit at all. Justify why a reserve is needed. If scientific research needs to be done, then simply do it - why does a reserve have to be created? A coordinated approach is required before selecting ad hoc areas to become marine reserves.				Option 4
I have seen no compelling scientific evidence to show why it should be a marine reserve. I am not interested in benefits to myself but in benefits to all users of this area & to the ecology of the area. I am concerned that DOC can act in such a cavalier fashion - not only should this proposal be advertised with public meetings in Auckland but the rest of the country as well. The size & location of this proposal means it is important to all New Zealanders. I am not convinced marine reserves serve any useful function. If they are meant to protect from over-fishing surely it would be better to decrease quota? Better scientific data could be obtained through monitoring habitat that was being used rather than one that was not. I believe better results will come from encouraging users to respect the environment while being able to use it.				Option 4
Reduce the quota, don't eliminate it.				Option 4

1333	23.06.03		Opotiki						Y	N									1	Y	QS
1334	23.06.03		Auckland				Y			OC		1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1335	23.06.03	Manurewa	Auckland				Y			OC		1							1	N	OO
1336	23.06.03	Stanmore Bay	Whangaparaoa			Y				O		1							1	N	OO
1337	23.06.03		Whangamata			Y				OC	1	1	1						1	N	OO
1338	23.06.03	Welcome Bay	Tauranga			Y				OC		1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1339	23.06.03	Western Springs	Auckland	Option 4 (Supporter)			Y			OC		1							1	N	OO
1340	23.06.03	Redwood	Christchurch				Y			OC		1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1341	23.06.03	Birkenhead	Auckland			Y				OC	1	1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1342	23.06.03		Mangawhai	Mangawhai Boating & Fishing Club Inc (President Elect)			Y			O		1		1	1				1	N	OO

A smaller area would be acceptable. A lot of clarification needed as to "where the goal posts of marine reserves actually lie". 'MPA News' makes several research points that divers also contribute to disturbance of the environment - surely a truly protected area should also exclude divers? DOC needs to bring people on board with goal of 10%. At present DOC is on an alienation path that will mean long term value and effectiveness of any proposed reserve is not going to be observed.				Option 4
Takes up too much of our recreational fishing space. If we are not careful a marine reserve will be forced upon us as happened with the Poor Knights.				Option 4
No need for any more reserves. Have a closed season during spawning for both private & commercial fishers. There would be no need for reserves. Pastoral farmers do not kill their stock.				Option 4
I do not believe any reserves should be considered until a strategic plan with full consultation is in place. DOC seems to have a "divide & conquer" mentality regarding these issues. The minority is trying to impose its will on the majority in this instance - this is totally undemocratic. We NZ public are all reasonable & wish to protect the environment for the future but this approach has been found wanting & we will stand & fight against it until we are fully involved.				Option 4
Reserve takes virtually all of fishable area on north east coast. Neither I nor my heirs will benefit. This area is an important area for safety reasons when the winds & seas do not allow fishing on the western side. Marine reserves deny the average member of the public who goes out on weekends & endeavour to get a fish meal for his family. Quotas and the fact that the public cannot sell their catch ensures recreational fishers cannot abuse their right.	All	All		Option 4
Not enough factual information for me to agree at this stage. The correct reserve combined with correctly imposed quotas will protect the environment. There needs to be debate and input from the whole country, especially Auckland. I do not believe there has been enough notification from DOC & think they are only looking at one side of the issue. I fail to see how a reserve to the 12 mile limit adds value - more facts are needed. The DOC document talks about the unique seafloor at 100 metres - this type of depth is self conserving & no divers or visitors will ever be able to see it. I would like to see DOC's plan & budget of how they are going to manage the area if it was a reserve.				Option 4
This one is too big. It is a blanket exclusion of my right to gather food to feed my family. Forcing me to go further out or along the coast in a small dinghy is asking for danger. Where is the scientific research required under the Marine Reserves Act? Unless you have the support of people you risk alienating the majority of law abiding fishers. How can you possibly enforce the area? Why not consultation meetings in Auckland?				Option 4
Why are other things being ignored i.e. commercial fishing still going on in the Marlborough Sounds, Kenepuru, which is a breeding ground for snapper?				Option 4
A marine reserve will curtail my use of the area. Unlikely for me to benefit from proposal without a reduction in silt, pollution flows from land, subdivision etc - marine reserves do nothing for this. Protection of the estuary is one thing that should be considered. I am possibly for closing fishing areas leading up to spawning & a total netting & set line ban for the area & also maximum fish size limits, catch & release methods & bans on gathering at-risk food sources higher up the food chain. Offshore areas with no protection & high fishing & diving pressure (e.g. White Island) remain pristine. Marine reserves increase pressure on other areas. Reserves associated with 'hotspots' are warranted, especially spawning areas, shellfish or specific objectives. DOC efforts on land are far more likely to improve the coastal and marine environment for future generations than marine reserves.	None			Option 4
There is no scientific proof to validate reserve creation. There must be areas available in estuary for the collecting of shellfish for the general public. All areas of Barrier are important to me as they are areas where the public can access their individual recreational bag limits of kaimoana. Show us factual science that irrefutably shows that marine reserve will be for the betterment of all New Zealanders.	Part	All		Option 4

1343	23.06.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland	NZ Big Game Fishing Council & RFC (Vice President & Board member)			Y					O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
1344	23.06.03		Thames					Y				OC			1							1	N	OO
1345	23.06.03	NewMarket	Auckland				Y					OC			1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1346	23.06.03	Whangaparaoa	Auckland				Y					O			1		1	1			1	1	N	OO
1347	23.06.03	Parnell	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1348	23.06.03	Howick	Auckland					Y				O			1	1	1					1	Y	QO
1349	23.06.03		Auckland					Y				OC			1							1	N	OO
1350	23.06.03	Waimauku	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1351	23.06.03	Mt Albert	Auckland					Y				OC			1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1352	23.06.03	Mt Wellington	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1					1	N	OO
1353	23.06.03	North Shore	Auckland					Y				OC			1		1					1	N	OO
1354	22.08.03	Mt Roskill	Auckland			Y						OC	1		1	1	1						N	OO
1355	23.06.03	Bethlehem	Tauranga					Y				OC			1	1						1	N	OO
1356	23.06.03	Epsom	Auckland					Y				OC			1		1					1	N	OO
1357	23.06.03	Browns Bay	Auckland	Brownzy Fishing Club (Member)			Y					O			1		1					1	N	OO
1358	23.06.03	Birkenhead	Auckland					Y				OC			1	1	1					1	N	QO
1359	22.08.03	Westmere	Auckland				Y					O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
1360	23.06.03		Hamilton			Y						O			1	1	1	1				1	Y	QS
1361	22.08.03	Mt Wellington	Auckland				Y		Y			O			1	1	1						N	OO

The proposal appears driven by personal agenda rather than science with reserves a poor attempt to manage a poorly managed fishery. I don't think anybody will benefit. I do not consider there is a requirement for a marine reserve in area proposed. DOC has failed to demonstrate a concrete reason e.g. scientific, fishery pressure or otherwise. There has been no scientific evidence produced to support the requirement for a marine reserve e.g. no unique or endangered species. There is no rationale behind the proposal to extend the reserve to 12 mile limit. No protection is required for pelagic species.				Option 4
The north east area of Great Barrier has some of the best fishing on the island				Option 4
Too restrictive. I will not benefit. I am happy to see commercial fishing excluded. Exclude commercial fishing first then monitor in years 1-5 years to check effects. All reserves should allow recreational use to co-exist alongside protection/conservation of the particular area & resources.	All	All		Option 4
No benefits to any.				Option 4
Not required, change daily catch limits and ban commercial activity. If it becomes a reserve I won't go there again as the main reason for my visits is for fishing & diving.	All	All		Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
Far too important a recreational area. There will be no benefit to me.				Option 4
Too much of an ad-hoc approach. I have previously responded to this survey & this response replaces the earlier one.				Option 4
This takes away the rights from everyday folk to gather a meal for their family by fishing. Won't see any benefits from such a remote area - the area is not accessible enough for education groups, sightseeing etc. The only people to travel that far are recreational fishers. If DOC can prove an economic benefit of reserve equal to the amount recreational fishermen put into economy then maybe something should be looked at? Concerned that I have not heard about this proposal before now as I spend time talking to commercial & recreational fishers all day.	All	All		Option 4
I also support no taxes and a reasonable and truthful government. You guys do not tell the truth regarding your aims. I won't benefit, stop netting & long-lining instead.	All	All		Option 4
It is one of my favourite places to fish & dive. I use the estuary to gather shellfish. I believe in sport fishing & diving quotas. Commercial fishing should be banned from the area.	All	All		Yes
Current usage is not adversely affecting the area due to accessibility. No studies have been carried out to support proposal so there is no evidence of benefit to any group. DOC appears to believe the locals are behind this proposal - who is DOC trying to deceive?	All	All		Option 4
Will not provide claimed benefits.				Option 4
GBI already has large area of default marine reserve with the Navy area. There are already enough reserves for this decade. All areas around GBI should be left alone except for local issued commercial fishing quotas & recreational fishing. DOC doesn't not have the right to make decisions about where New Zealanders can fish. DOC can't manage their current portfolio of property. A public referendum needs to be held. DOC are not adhering to charter of public consultancy.	All	All		Option 4
The proposed area gives no thought to allowing one to safely travel north or south along this coastline if you have any form of sea life on your vessel. Much smaller reserves with plenty of open passages would be a lot better idea to allow people to boat through area with sea life on board. Why does DOC mislead the public about the amount of marine protection? I am are there is only 1% marine reserves but what about other no-fishing, no-anchoring areas?			Smaller areas, with open passages in between.	Option 4
It is a safe place to go fishing, diving & relaxing. I cannot see any benefit as it would restrict my ability to shelter in area & would put pressure on remaining coast. The unpredictability of weather is a natural guardian. Area provides both east & west coast environments within easy reach of Auckland.	All	All		Yes
Retention and growth of all marine life in the area. All coastal areas inside Arid Island should remain open for recreational purposes.	All	Areas 1, 2 & parts of 4 & 5 that are inside Arid Island.	Areas 3, 6, 7, 8 & area 5 on outside of Arid Island.	Option 4
Don't ruin a good piece of natural NZ coastline. No benefit. DOC would be far better to put some effort into existing DOC areas e.g. Forestry Bay jetty etc.		All		Yes

1362	23.06.03	Medlands Beach	Great Barrier Is			Y													O				1	1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1363	23.06.03		Palmerston North				Y												OC				1			1			1	N	OO
1364	23.06.03	Mairangi Bay	Auckland				Y												OC				1		1	1			1	N	OO
1365	23.06.03		Hamilton						Y										N										1	Y	S
1366	23.06.03	Howick	Auckland				Y												OC				1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1367	23.06.03	Parnell	Auckland				Y												OC				1	1		1			1	N	OO
1368	23.06.03	Mairangi Bay	Auckland				Y												OC				1						1	N	OO
1369	23.06.03	Muriwai Beach	Auckland				Y												OC				1			1			1	N	OO
1370	23.06.03	Glenfield	Auckland	Company Director			Y												OC	1			1		1				1	Y	QS
1371	23.06.03	Albany	Auckland				Y												OC				1	1	1				1	N	OO
1372	23.06.03	Remuera	Auckland	Outboard Boating Club (member)			Y												O				1		1				1	N	OO
1373	23.06.03	East Tamaki	Auckland				Y												OC				1						1	Y	QS
1374	23.06.03	Torbay	Auckland				Y												O				1	1	1				1	N	OO
1375	23.06.03		Hamilton				Y												OC				1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1376	23.06.03	Howick	Auckland				Y												OC				1	1					1	Y	OO
1377	22.08.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland	Hauraki Gulf Sports Fishing Club (Committee)			Y												OC				1	1		1				N	OO
1378	23.06.03	Birkenhead	Auckland				Y												OC				1			1			1	N	OO
1379	23.06.03	Hastings	Hawkes Bay				Y												OC				1		1				1	N	OO
1380	23.06.03	Takapuna	Auckland				Y												OC				1			1	1		1	N	OO
1381	23.06.03	Mt Albert	Auckland				Y												N										1	N	OO
1382	23.06.03	Titirangi	Auckland				Y												OC				1	1					1	Y	QS
1383	23.06.03	Mission Bay	Auckland				Y												OC				1						1	N	OO
1384	23.06.03	Roseneath	Wellington				Y												OC				1	1	1				1	N	OO

Plenty of options nearer population centres to protect first. Let's encourage the development of eco-tourism, including recreational fishing & charter fishing as the potential is huge. We think fish stocks will regenerate naturally if commercial fishing was banned. We support harsher penalties for those flouting the laws.	All	All		Option 4
Historical record of DOC initiatives which disadvantage recreational fishing has destroyed trust in their sincerity, their objectivity and their unstated agenda.				Option 4
Area is not under stress from recreational fishing. The fishing in area has improved significantly over the years. Because the area is not sheltered it is not as accessible as west coast of GBI. If less than 100 Barrier residents support it how will it be enforced? It will be ignored and unenforceable.				Option 4
Should help to repopulate adjacent fishing grounds.				Option 4
Area far enough away from mainland not to need it.				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
It's not required.				Option 4
Police existing rules. Education, enforcement & public awareness are sufficient tools.				Option 4
Help sustain fish stocks. My feeling is that marine reserves are fine in principle & I would like to see a consultative approach with both commercial and recreational fishers involved and residents near where reserves are earmarked. We can have thousands of small reserves scattered evenly along coast so the many small boat owners with limited safe boating distance are able to fish around or near these reserves. Super reserves are not on, given the many other options.				Option 4
A marine reserve is not needed if you reduce commercial fishers. The area is self regulating. Time would be better spent addressing why reserves are needed in the first place and regulate those operators.				Option 4
Do not believe it is warranted. I have fished & dived there 25 years and fish stocks have remained fairly constant.		All		Option 4
Healthy for the area's fishing and diving. No argument with principle, just that the mooted area is too large.				Option 4
Better management of fisheries is required, not closing them down so they cannot be enjoyed by all who live in NZ. Cannot see anyone benefiting from this proposal.	All	All		Option 4
Questions are misleading with the purpose of manipulation from DOC. No benefit & only encourages poaching and pressure on other areas. Marine reserves should be carefully researched not just designated on the whim of public opinion. Lower catch limits and adequate monitoring of commercial infringements are the only solutions to over fishing.				Option 4
As a government organisation does DOC think they have the right to make unilateral decisions? Proposals must be supported by scientific study and evidence. In addition a thorough consultative process needs to take place.				Option 4
You have already destroyed the Poor Knights for us when you already had half the islands as a reserve. Sort out the commercial fishers before you pick on us. Recreational fishers are not the problem. All forms of commercial & recreational nets should be banned. Also stop mussel farms as they have already filled up too many of our bays.	All	All		Yes
I use this area for recreation & find that changes are against what I consider are my customary rights.				Option 4
Because marine reserves don't work. No benefits. The focus should be on managing resources we have, not stopping peoples rights to fish for food. If the government is so concerned about protecting future fishing, why was the commercial fishing quota increased?		All		Option 4
Objection is solely based on misuse of natural process by DOC. The entire DOC process is slanted towards DOC achieving their aims without due process. Due process & comprehensive public consultation must be mandatory.				Option 4
I won't benefit.	All			Option 4
Secured fishing environment. Exclude all of the estuary.	All			Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
The fishery is looked after by present shellfish gathering regulations. I would not benefit.				Option 4

1385	23.06.03	Greenhithe	North Shore					Y										1	N	QO
1386	23.06.03	Papatoetoe	Auckland					Y										1	N	OO
1387	23.06.03	Takapuna	Auckland					Y										1	N	OO
1388	23.06.03	Kamo	Whangarei					Y										1	N	OO
1389	23.06.03	RD 2	Rotorua					Y										1	Y	OO
1390	23.06.03	RD2 Papakura	Auckland					Y										1	N	OO
1391	23.06.03	Onehunga	Auckland					Y										1	N	OO
1392	23.06.03	Meadowbank	Auckland					Y										1	Y	S
1393	23.06.03		Hamilton					Y										1	N	OO
1394	23.06.03		Tokoroa					Y										1	N	OO
1395	23.06.03	Te Atatu South	Auckland					Y										1	N	OO
1396	23.06.03	Henderson	Auckland					Y										1	N	OO
1397	23.06.03	RD 2	Hamilton					Y										1	N	OO
1398	23.06.03		Cambridge					Y										1	N	OO
1399	23.06.03		Tokoroa	Tokoroa Sports Fishing Association- (Salt water delegate)				Y										1	Y	QS
1400	22.06.03	Titirangi	Auckland					Y										1	Y	S
1401	22.06.03	RD3 Awakeri	Whakatane	Te Arawa, Tuho, Clan Reid				Y										1	Y	QS
1402	22.06.03	Mission Bay	Auckland					Y										1	N	OO
1403	22.06.03	Callum Brae	Hamilton						Y	N								1	N	QO
1404	30.06.03	Beachlands	Auckland	Clevedon Pub Fishing Club (President)				Y										1	N	OO

Recreational fishing (perhaps with reduced limits) does not impact the marine environment to a great extent. The benefit of this proposal is that it would keep commercial out of this area. I believe in the idea of a marine reserve but recreational fishing should be allowed in it. Reduced catch or size limits could apply in this area as an alternative.				Option 4
I don't benefit.				Option 4
Lower the daily allowable recreational catch from 9 to 5 snapper per person instead. I won't benefit from this proposal & having a reserve to go around if I have already caught snapper elsewhere along the coast is inconvenient & potentially dangerous.				Option 4
No proven need that one is required. There is no evidence from the Poor Knights closure that marine reserves work other than the closure to fishermen and opening up commercial ventures for divers to have exclusive rights.				Option 4
Support the principle but not necessarily the location on the north east coast that DOC wants. All of it should be excluded until proper local/public consultation has been undertaken. DOC needs to stop rushing this proposal through with minimal consultation & notice. More studies into marine reserves are required before locking up our fisheries forever. Fully explain benefits and support this with factual studies.	All			Option 4
Not of this scale, boats staying out of weather can't even have a fish. The benefit would be preservation of a nice remote bit of the coast. Do not include Harotaonga as it is a popular place to stay & fish, as are the waters between Arid Island & the mainland. It should not be a no take reserve as people should be able to catch a fish to eat in moderation. Commercial efforts should be excluded & this would make a big impact.		Areas 4 & 5.		Option 4
Random selection of site with little valid scientific justification for site selection. I see little benefit in totally excluding significant user groups on the scale proposed.				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
Area is already well protected due to remoteness.	All	All		Option 4
Needs further discussion. I won't benefit. Why is it that every time DOC propose a marine reserve it is shrouded in secrecy? Answer is that they know they will not get much support from the section of public who uses the areas for recreational use.	All	All		Option 4
It will stop me catching fish and diving for crays.		All		Option 4
Fishing/recreational rights.		All		Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
We have too many now.				Option 4
Enhance fisheries around reserve as long as reserve is not too big. I support the concept of marine reserves as long as full consultation takes place & all interested parties are listened to. The proposed reserve is too large & will be detrimental to the recreational fishing industry which brings a lot of revenue to both NZ & GBI. Why is DOC so interested in establishing marine reserves when marine parks would give them the ability to manage the area to the satisfaction of all marine users?				Option 4
Preserve fish stocks.				Option 4
Exclude some of estuary for food gathering. All NZ waters should be protected from commercial fishing by trawlers. The rights of fishers in NZ should be protected.	Part			Option 4
Marine reserves tie up fishing grounds. Freedom to fish in all areas is a right that I don't want to give up lightly. I support Option 4 efforts.				Option 4
Do not support proposal to the extent intended. Not against establishment of "reasonable" areas of marine reserve if there is a reasoned argument of their establishment & they are not so large as to restrict the ability of present & future generations from recreational fishing. This proposal would allow future generations to get an appreciation of local marine life & environment. GBI residents are not the only interested parties. Consultation needs to be wider.				Option 4
Object to the way DOC is trying to push it through. Total lack of consultation with visitors like myself & my family who visit the area for recreational reasons. It will have a huge financial impact on islanders income produced by visitors each year if they cannot have freedom of movement.				Option 4

1405	30.06.03	Titirangi	Auckland					Y										OC			1	1		1			1	N	OO
1406	30.06.03	Remuera	Auckland					Y										OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1407	30.06.03		Thames					Y										O			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1408	30.06.03	Pakuranga	Auckland					Y										OC			1			1			1	N	OO
1409	30.06.03	Torbay	Auckland					Y										OC			1	1		1			1	N	OO
1410	30.06.03	Howick	Auckland	Big Fish Fishing Club (President)				Y										O			1	1					1	N	OO
1411	30.06.03	Whangaparaoa	Auckland	Tasti Products (Factory Manager)				Y										OC			1						1	N	OO
1412	30.06.03	Cherrywood	Tauranga					Y										OC			1	1		1			1	N	OO
1413	30.06.03	Auckland Mail Centre	Auckland					Y										O	1		1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1414	30.06.03	Huapai	Auckland					Y										OC	1		1						1	N	OO
1415	30.06.03	Titirangi	Auckland					Y										OC			1		1	1			1	N	OO
1416	30.06.03	Hunua RD3	Papakura					Y										OC			1						1	N	OO
1417	30.06.03	Royal Oak	Auckland					Y										OC			1	1		1			1	N	OO
1418	22.06.03		Mangawhai	Ngati Wai				Y										OC	1		1		1				1	Y	QS
1419	22.06.03	Glendowie	Auckland					Y										OC						1			1	N	OO
1420	22.06.03		Hamilton					Y										O			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1421	22.06.03	Takapuna	Auckland					Y										OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO

Over 25% of NZ population lives in Auckland & lots are fishers & divers - how about managing the resources better so Aucklanders for many generations to come can cast a line. It's part of being a kiwi. Better management would involve better enforcement, no-fishing months during spawning seasons etc. It is important that the proposal is given much greater thought - perhaps decisions should be made by public referendum.				Option 4
Unnecessary & unjustified erosion of rights of average New Zealander to partake in reasonable way of the sea in accordance with our culture & heritage. Consultation is a farce & DOC's reasons are not convincing.	All	All		Option 4
Move it south to cover no-anchorage zone. Leave the only safe anchorages on the east coast out of the reserve - otherwise I could be fishing at Rosalie Bay & won't be able to anchor overnight at Arid Cove. Why not look at closing the inner reaches of the Firth of Thames to all fishing over snapper spawning season. We don't shoot ducks all year round.	All	Safe anchorages.		Option 4
Have seen no evidence presented to show benefits resulting from such a reserve on relatively isolated coast. This is the only "blue water" recreational fishery accessible from Auckland.		All		Option 4
The public are not aware of the proposal & full debate needs to be had. This could set precedent for future proposals based on limited public awareness & input. Process is being steamrolled.				Option 4
No reserve required here at all. Subject has been discussed at length at Big Fish meetings & total feeling is that there is no need for a reserve on this area of our coastline. We are not against all reserves & believe they have a place but not in an area utilised by greatest public in NZ.				Option 4
Double standards as they are to allow commercial concessions for a cut of 7%. There is one law for the poor & one for the rich. No benefit to recreational fishers from marine reserve - reduce commercial quotas instead. Average fisher cannot get out to GBI due to weather conditions & distance.	All	All		Option 4
Not until complete analysis of existing marine reserves is done & has been discussed with all interested parties.				Option 4
Far too restrictive as it is very popular accessible area. Stupid to place large marine reserve in area so close to NZ's major city. It is a right of New Zealanders to catch sensible limits of fish for the table.	All	All		Option 4
I am not convinced from the information supplied that a reserve would benefit any recreational fisher.				Option 4
Too many reserves in stupid places. It is a remote place which few people visit, too far for anyone to go for a casual sightsee/snorkel, unlike Goat Island.		All		Option 4
Recreational fishing is getting harder without reserves. I can't think of any benefit, the north east of GBI is hardly fished or exploited now. Why should we be looking at a reserve at all when the distance from mainland excludes over fishing and diving.		All		Option 4
Questions are weighted & designed to deceive & provide biased statistics. I won't benefit unless there is recreational fishing. Entire island should be free to all recreational users - fishing & diving. Maybe stop the commercial exploitation. Island is isolated enough without making it a marine reserve & is ideal for tourism. Need to stop boats discharging sewage into sea.		All		Option 4
Good to have small areas set aside to allow fish stocks to regenerate. Exclude offshore submerged rocks & sheltered areas where users of area can seek shelter while fishing. Reduce size to something more reasonable. Move commercial fishers especially trawlers out into deep water & close fishery during spawning periods.		Sheltered fishing areas.		Option 4
DOC arguments for the proposal are false. They have not established a need for one or that a reserve will be of benefit. Majority of locals are opposed. If reserve is established it should be small, results should be monitored for 10-20 years by independent people, not DOC. My personal experience from Hahei is that since the marine reserve has been established the fishing in surrounding areas has slowly deteriorated - I am concerned that DOC officials are trying to justify reserves by lies such as that fishing improves in surrounding areas.	All	All		Option 4
Too many close to Auckland.				Option 4
What scientific study is proposed? Not benefit to me. Biggest threat to NZ coast is DOC, they cannot look after land mass they manage and are just empire building. I have had dealings with DOC since 1988 & have never had a straight deal from them yet.		All		Option 4

1422	22.06.03	Parnell	Auckland				Y				O	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1423	22.06.03	Mangakino	Taupo				Y				O			1			1				1	N	OO	
1424	22.06.03	Castor Bay	North Shore			Y					OC			1	1						1	N	OO	
1425	22.06.03	Milford	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1					1	N	OO	
1426	22.06.03	Redvale	Auckland				Y				OC			1		1	1				1	N	OO	
1427	22.06.03	Coopers Beach	Northland 0557				Y				OC			1								N	OO	
1428	22.06.03		Tauranga				Y				OC			1			1				1	N	OO	
1429	22.08.03	Arkles Bay	Whangaparaoa				Y				O			1								N	OO	
1430	22.06.03	Whangaparapara	Great Barrier Is	Great Barrier Lodge (Manager)	Y	Y					O	1			1	1	1				1	N	OO	
1431	22.06.03	Laingholm	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				1	N	OO	
1432	22.06.03		Wanganui				Y				O			1	1	1	1				1	N	OO	
1433	22.06.03	Mairangi Bay	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1						1	N	OO	
1434	22.06.03	Milford	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				1	N	OO	
1435	22.06.03	Whau Valley	Whangarei				Y				O			1	1	1					1	N	OO	
1436	22.06.03	NSW	Australia						Y		O			1	1						1	N	OO	
1437	22.06.03	Newmarket	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1		1				1	N	OO	
1438	22.06.03	Remuera	Auckland				Y				OC			1					1		1	N	OO	
1439	22.06.03	Glenfield	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				1	N	OO	
1440	21.06.03	Remuera	Auckland				Y				OC			1		1					1	N	OO	
1441	21.06.03	Conifer Grove	Papakura				Y				O			1							1	N	OO	
1442	21.06.03	Greenhithe	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1					1	N	OO	
1443	21.06.03	Mt Eden	Auckland		Y		Y				OC						1				1	N	OO	
1444	21.06.03	RD 1	Tokoroa	Tokoroa Sportfishing Association (President)			Y				OC			1	1						1	N	OO	
1445	21.06.03	Weymouth	Auckland				Y				OC			1							1	N	OO	

You will take away only area to catch pink maomao in Hauraki Gulf which our family has been doing for over 60 years. Reserve is totally misplaced, too far north, already a no-anchor zone in area. Waterfront property owners values will deflate because of reserve, as happened in Canada & USA.		All		Option 4
It will affect my regular holidays. Why not have a reserve in the north of GBI where there is limited land access. Meeting should not just be in Auckland as visitors come from all over NZ.				Option 4
Other methods of stock protection have not been addressed. No sound scientific justification. Other issues such as nutrient runoff, CLE, commercial fishers etc. Cuvier Island would be a better reserve.			Cuvier Island.	Option 4
Use by recreational fishers has no detrimental effect. DOC doesn't listen to any opinions except their own.	All	All		Option 4
Proposed area too large. Don't protect northern end of GBI and offshore reefs.		Areas 3, 6 & 7.		Option 4
No detailed scientific studies have been done.				Option 4
Area is close to the largest population in NZ & therefore should have full recreational fishing rights. No benefit to me. No more proposals until there is sufficient scientific data available so that informed decision can be made by all parties.				Option 4
If reserves are necessary they should be away from residential areas e.g. Cuvier Island. I am not aware of any benefits a reserve would create.			Cuvier Island.	Yes
Reserves are not an effective conservation tool. To conserve fish stocks reduce fishing during spawning times. As fish migrate through marine reserves they do not work. Proposal is purely a land grab.	All			Option 4
Existing laws in place to protect area, use them. Get your act together with "Fisheries". DOC appear to be on a control mission both on the land and the sea.	All	All		Option 4
Enough reserves already around NZ.				Option 4
The question about support could be taken to mean whatever DOC wanted. Listen to the general public of New Zealand - not be hell bent pandering to the wishes of the minority.		All		Option 4
I won't benefit.				Option 4
Stop commercial fishing and there will be plenty of fish for everybody. Pay attention to us and not just the greenies.				Option 4
Not a practical of feasible use to tie up the water when very few can utilise it as a reserve. It will limit secure anchorages. I cannot see any benefit to me because of the isolation. Do not protect areas that are no good for diving as divers are the target group. A no take reserve would unnecessarily penalise the majority to please a few.	All	All		Option 4
Police the law of the land today and not put more barriers up. Problems have arisen from overseas & new immigrants running roughshod over laws and depleting stocks. Where is a strategic plan for the future - if we are not careful citizens of NZ will be land-locked.				Option 4
It will be poorly managed by DOC. I will not benefit.				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
Not needed in this area.				Option 4
Not necessary. DOC needs to respect the rights of all & give all New Zealanders the opportunity to take a kid fishing.	All	All		Option 4
I do not believe this proposal is in the best interests of the NZ Public. I don't see any benefit. I am happy to consider marine reserves in areas the the public do not have a history of recreational fishing. I would rather support reductions to commercial take. I have seen the fishing deteriorate in Auckland over my 51 years - is there a link with water quality as this has also deteriorated.	All	All		Option 4
Not enough information provided to make a decision. I think I would benefit from a more holistic approach to conservation rather than misguided over-protection. There needs to be more consultation to show how marine reserves are proven to benefit the public good. Let's stop the haste, there is no need for it. DOC should formalise a more thorough assessment that includes all of Option 4's points.				Option 4
Not proven to be effective. Open it up for total discussion and participation by all users & have realistic submission dates e.g. 4 months. No one will benefit. DOC would have to be the worst government department of all time as they tell lies & are ill informed, malicious, untrustworthy.				Option 4
Too many recreational areas are being lost.				Option 4

1446	21.06.03	Huntly West	Huntly						Y	O				1	1					1	N	OO
1447	21.06.03	Hillcrest	Auckland				Y			O	1		1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1448	21.06.03	Westbrook	Rotorua				Y			OC			1							1	N	OO
1449	21.06.03	Manurewa	Manukau				Y			OC			1							1	N	OO
1450	22.06.03		Te Awamutu					Y		OC			1		1					1	Y	S
1451	22.06.03	Cooks Beach RD1	Whitianga				Y			N										1	N	OO
1452	22.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is			Y				O			1		1					1	N	OO
1453	22.06.03	Milford	Auckland				Y			OC			1							1	N	OO
1454	22.06.03	Titirangi	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1						1	N	OO
1455	22.06.03	RD 1	Queenstown				Y			OC	1				1					1	N	OO
1456	21.06.03	Kerikeri	Bay of Islands	Tourism (Director)			Y			O			1	1		1	1			1	N	OO
1457	21.06.03	RD 2, Kaiwaka	Mangawhai Heads				Y			OC			1		1					1	N	OO
1458	21.06.03		Hamilton 2001				Y			OC			1	1		1				1	N	OO
1459	21.06.03	Stanmore Bay	Whangaparaoa				Y			OC			1		1					1	N	OO
1460	21.06.03		Putaruru				Y			OC			1							1	N	OO
1461	21.06.03	Pt Chevalier	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1462	21.06.03	Point Chevalier	Auckland				Y			OC				1						1	N	OO
1463	21.06.03	Massey	Auckland	Furuno Fishing Club (Committee member)			Y			OC			1							1	N	OO
1464	21.06.03	Mangere East	Auckland				Y			OC			1							1	N	OO
1465	22.08.03	Half Moon Bay	Auckland	PYBC & BBYC (Member)			Y			O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
1466	21.06.03	Manurewa	Auckland				Y			OC					1					1	N	OO
1467	21.06.03	Beachlands	Manukau				Y			OC			1			1				1	N	OO

Commercial fishing needs to be reduced using existing legislation, not by penalising recreational users. No reserves, marine parks instead. By trying to create a marine reserve, DOC will force recreational fishers more in other areas that are not protected. In the long term this will cause more damage to fish resources.				Option 4
Do not support the wording of the support question. Marine reserves will not benefit me nor the hammered environment as it is the commercial pressure doing all the damage. If a reserve is created, it should be to exclude commercial activity. It will be impossible to police this proposal. Target areas where usage is not already high & reduce quotas to sensible levels & further regulate commercial fishing.				Option 4
Lack of wide public consultation and lack of scientific data indicating need for a marine reserve. Research is needed on effects of water pollution on the marine environment. Reserves need to be based on established scientific need.				Option 4
I am not against marine reserves, just their location. Exclude all of estuary. Look for the tidal mangrove areas as these need protecting.	All	All		Option 4
Fish numbers will build, supporting connected breeding grounds and consequently the future for good recreational fishing is secured. Need marine reserves to carry out benefits to all, not just greenies.				Option 4
Because of the way DOC have handled the proposal. I won't benefit.				Option 4
Will just put more pressure on surrounding areas.				Option 4
No evidence that it is needed in this location. This proposal is based on no evidence. It is disturbing that it is proposed to lock up vast tracts of sea in perpetuity in a random fashion. There has to be a logical nationwide plan to co-ordinate this unseemly rush to dot marine reserves all over the coastline.				Option 4
Until DOC are open and honest with the public of NZ about what their plans are nationally and regionally I do not support the principle of a marine reserve anywhere. Why should I answer these questions - what are the purpose of these questions - questions are loaded. The lack of consultation & dishonest way DOC has gone about this makes the outcome of consultation meaningless. It is time the Minister took control of the situation. To have ad hoc proposals being put to the public without consideration, supporting research & knowledge about what the overall plan is, is a recipe for failure.				Option 4
Scrap the idea. I don't think I will benefit at all.	All	All		Option 4
The area is self governing & does not need protection due to natural hostile environment. It will not be beneficial in any way. Commercial trawling within 10 miles of any part of coast should be forbidden.	All	All		Option 4
Sheltered area for fishing and diving.				Option 4
See no benefit to environment or to community. Do not support a reserve until independent scientific research proves the need. DOC is using pseudo-science to justify reserves & are trying to make this a GBI issue only when the majority of users are from off the island. DOC has not consulted enough.		All		Option 4
Why should we lose out to bureaucrats that fail to consult with the public? The estuary is commonly used by small boats for recreational fishing.	All			Option 4
Not in current format. I personally will not benefit. Am happy for Option 4 to put my points of view to DOC.				Option 4
I fish this area & will not benefit from a reserve. DOC has handled this matter in the most underhand manner possible. Auckland boating and recreational fishers use this area extensively				Option 4
Area takes care of itself.				Option 4
Proposal lacks definition. If the area was properly policed, a reserve would not be needed. Keep commercial trawlers away.				Option 4
Not enough information, no proof. Why is DOC allowed to handle this process without the public?				Option 4
It is not necessary to waste this wonderful area as a reserve. No benefit whatsoever.	All	All		Yes
It is in violation of the basic human rights act. I would not benefit at all.	All	All		Option 4
I would not say yes to something that was no specific. The benefit to me would depend on extent of reserve and how it was managed. The area is very accessible to residents of Auckland - why have they not been involved in the consultation process?				Option 4

1468	21.06.03		Opotiki				Y			OC			1		1				1	N	OO
1469	21.06.03	Morningside	Auckland	Manukau Sportsfishing Club (Board member)			Y			OC			1	1					1	N	OO
1470	21.06.03	Pahoia	Tauranga				Y			OC	1		1						1	N	OO
1471	21.06.03	Herne Bay	Auckland				Y			OC			1						1	N	OO
1472	21.06.03	Bethlehem	Tauranga				Y			OC			1		1				1	N	OO
1473	21.06.03	Waterford	Hamilton				Y			OC			1		1	1			1	N	OO
1474	21.06.03		Nelson				Y			OC			1	1					1	N	OO
1475	21.06.03	Remuera	Auckland				Y			OC			1		1	1			1	N	OO
1476	21.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y					OC			1						1	N	OO
1477	21.06.03	Hamilton East	Hamilton				Y			OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1478	21.06.03	Remuera	Auckland				Y			O			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1479	21.06.03		Nelson				Y			OC			1			1			1	N	OO
1480	21.06.03	Orakei	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1		1			1	N	OO
1481	21.06.03		Morrinsville				Y			OC			1	1		1			1	N	OO
1482	21.06.03	Berhampore	Wellington				Y			OC			1						1	N	OO
1483	21.06.03	Kaitoke	Great Barrier Is	Tangata whenua/settlers (descendant)		Y				O	1		1		1	1	1		1	N	OO
1484	21.06.03	Kaitoke	Great Barrier Is	Tangata whenua/settlers	Y					O			1		1	1			1	N	OO
1485	21.06.03	Epsom	Auckland				Y			OC	1		1	1	1	1			1	Y	QO
1486	21.06.03		Whangamata				Y			OC			1	1	1					Y	QO
1487	21.06.03	Penrose	Auckland				Y			O			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1488	22.08.03	Matakana	Warkworth				Y			O			1	1	1					N	OO

Do not believe marine reserves to be the best tool to deal with the fish stocks and environment. I will not benefit, but possibly better diving for crayfish & maybe fishing on boundaries. DO not believe marine reserves would benefit overall fish stocks or increase visitation to the island. A reserve will condense fishing into other areas. Marine reserves are not the answer to halting decline in fish stocks.				Option 4
No scientific basis for marine reserve. This is political process run amok. I have answered the questions I deem necessary for DOC to comprehend my position on this proposal.				Option 4
I will not benefit at all. Obviously DOC does not believe in consultation. Marine areas belong to all New Zealanders & are not for the exclusive use of those living nearby.				Option 4
Put all marine reserves in the South Island.				Option 4
I won't support it if it specifies a no take zone. I struggle to see any benefits.				Option 4
Better management of area could accomplish same goal as a marine reserve. Unless I can fish in the reserve there would be no benefit. All parties using the area should respect the area		All		Option 4
There are enough marine reserves. This area offers fantastic recreational fishing and should be preserved as such.	All	All		Option 4
The question posed is too broad & a yes could be misconstrued. I may support a marine reserve but need a far more detailed proposal. I do not see benefits for me in the DOC proposal. On the contrary, I may lost the opportunity for recreational fishing & diving. GBI proposal is not just about the marine reserve but all about inconsistencies in policy & principle, misrepresentation, selective reporting, exclusion from proper process etc. I expect better from a government department.				Option 4
You have chosen too large an area, would stopping commercial and trawling for fish have the same effect?				Option 4
There has not been proper public consultation. I believe this is part of a wider process with a hidden agenda, which will result in ordinary New Zealanders being prevented from activities which are rightfully their. I strongly urge DOC to take note of what the majority of New Zealanders say on this matter.	All	All		Option 4
I do not believe it is necessary.		All		Option 4
Cannot support it until 'somewhere' is researched with information made public.				Option 4
No evidence to prove current recreational users cause environmental degradation. I propose an exclusion zone for commercial long-line & trawl fishing within 20 km of the shoreline as being an adequate reserve for the area proposed.				Option 4
A blanket no fishing area is not going to achieve anything. We just need to regulate limits we have at present. Very few, if any, recreational fishers plunder the sea. Rather than ban all fishing, keep commercial interests out. I won't benefit & it will wreck the opportunity to have people explore the island & taking their children fishing.				Option 4
I do not think this is an appropriate area for a marine reserve.				Option 4
North east coast does a good job of looking after itself so make it somewhere else like the Hauraki Gulf - shutdown the area for a time during spawning season. I won't benefit from a marine reserve in any way. Keep out commercial fishers from GBI including diving charters, cray fishers (except local ones) & target those who take undersize seafood & pollute the environment.				Option 4
Manage the 16 marine reserves that have already been created or turn the entire Hauraki Gulf into one throughout spawning season as this would be 200% more beneficial to the environment in long term. I won't benefit from a marine reserve in any way as I won't be able to use it to enjoy.	All			Option 4
Would like to see small reserve incorporating a fish farming enterprise that puts stock back for future recreational fishers. Under the Bill of Rights I claim my rights as a NZ citizen to collect shellfish & harvest fish from the sea. The suggestion of such a large reserve is seriously flawed in that no recent surveys have been conducted, the population at large has been denied the opportunity to comment on such a proposal in an open forum.				Option 4
Nil personal benefit. Do not protect Arid Island & offshore reefs.		Areas 5 & 6.		Option 4
I like to fish there.				Option 4
Not given.				Yes

1489	21.06.03	Stanmore Bay	Auckland				Y				OC	1		1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1490	21.06.03		Papamoa						Y		OC			1		1				1	N	OO
1491	21.06.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is			Y					O			1						1	N	OO
1492	21.06.03	Mt Eden	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1493	22.08.03	Epsom	Auckland				Y				O			1	1	1					N	OO
1494	21.06.03	Taradale	Napier						Y		N										N	OO
1495	21.06.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland				Y				O			1		1				1	N	OO
1496	21.06.03	Torbay	Auckland	Ngati Tama				Y			OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1497	21.06.03	RD2	Motueka				Y				OC			1	1					1	N	OO
1498	21.06.03	Arkles Bay	Whangaparaoa				Y		Y		O			1	1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1499	21.06.03	Henderson	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1500	21.06.03		Whangamata				Y				O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1501	21.06.03		Whangamata				Y				O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1502	21.06.03		Whangamata				Y				O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1503	22.08.03		Whangaparaoa				Y				O			1		1	1				N	OO
1504	22.08.03		New Plymouth				Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1505	21.06.03		Whangamata				Y				O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1506	21.06.03		Whangamata				Y				O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1507	21.06.03		Whangamata				Y				O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1508	21.06.03		Whangamata				Y				O			1	1	1				1	N	OO

No proof that recreational take is causing decline in stocks. Reserves must not be justified as fisheries management tools. Recreational bag limits and the Quota Management System should be used to ensure continued biodiversity. No benefit to me but a negative impact on my lifestyle. Marine reserves are heavy handed, ineffectual, non-flexible exclusion zones. Please formulate and consult with nation regarding a national reserves policy before proceeding with any further specific reserve proposals. The policy should allow for more flexible use & access. Defacto reserves such as cable zones should be included in any policy.	All	All		Option 4
Put marine reserves away from main centres to leave local oceans for recreational fishing. This means that the minimum of fishermen are inconvenienced & it still provides the space the ecological people are demanding.	All	All		Option 4
A reserve will just put more pressure on surrounding areas.				Option 4
It is not necessary and will restrict my recreational fishing.				Option 4
Choose an area where not so many recreational users will be affected, a more remote area e.g. Mokohinau Islands. I have a long association with GBI & the marine reserve proposal runs into direct conflict with the recreational fishers who use this area. I cannot see recreational fishers impacting on the deep water parts of the proposal. My preferred boundaries are to extend the southern boundary to past the Navy area & reduce the northern boundary to south of Whangapoua Beach. Any exclusion in the estuary will favour a few & exacerbate exclusivity. I am genuinely interested in the concept of marine reserves but wonder if it is the correct concept here. The greatest way for reserves to succeed is to have the fullest acceptance of the public so perhaps DOC should compromise to achieve this.	All	Areas 2 & 3.	Area 4,	Yes & Letter
Insufficient research done. In NZ at present is a government who does not see importance of recreational fishing. There is a destruction of fisheries including game fishing - there is almost no tuna or marlin for recreational fishers from East Cape to Hawke's Bay. Reserves may not be the solution without a lot more consultation and research. Concerned about the impacts of mussel farms, including locating them in popular fishing areas. Wants NZ protected for all, not just one group e.g. Maori.				Option 4
Due to weather conditions it is largely untouched. I can see no benefit for me.				Option 4
Not convinced that this is the best option. There is very little information & a need for a master plan. More justifications for a reserve need to be made public and information about the plan for NZ. I am concerned at what appears to be an ad hoc approach by DOC to marine reserve establishment. I agree we need some protection for our marine species but we need also to carefully and scientifically consider plans with all New Zealanders.	All			Option 4
No demonstrated benefit for recreational fishing.				Option 4
Not practical and would not work. Better to restrict commercial fisheries if anything. DOC would be better spending taxpayers money on cleaning up polluted harbours & creating fish farms & restricting commercial fishing such as trawlers that destroy the sea floor.				Option 4
This area is not in reach of most people and therefore the pressure on fish is nil. I will not benefit in any way. I have been visiting the area for the last 25 years & have seen no evidence of over-fishing or declining fish numbers.	All			Option 4
We require the rights of New Zealanders to fish where we like and not to be told where to go.	All			Option 4
We require the rights of New Zealanders to fish where we like and not to be told where to go.	All			Option 4
We require the rights of New Zealanders to fish where we like and not to be told where to go.	All			Option 4
There are other places rather than GBI.				Yes
A marine reserve under current legislation is far too restrictive. I foresee no benefit. There are other options to ensure the sustainability of the marine environment which will be agreed upon by all parties.	All	All		Yes
We require the rights of New Zealanders to fish where we like and not to be told where to go.	All			Option 4
We require the rights of New Zealanders to fish where we like and not to be told where to go.	All			Option 4
We require the rights of New Zealanders to fish where we like and not to be told where to go.	All			Option 4
We require the rights of New Zealanders to fish where we like and not to be told where to go.	All			Option 4

1509	21.06.03	Pukekohe	Auckland	Ngati Awa				Y			OC			1		1				1	N	OO
1510	21.06.03		Whangamata				Y				O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1511	21.06.03	Manly	Auckland				Y				O			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1512	21.06.03	Torbay	Auckland				Y				OC					1			1		N	OO
1513	21.06.03	Torbay	Auckland				Y				O			1	1					1	N	OO
1514	21.06.03	RD2	Te Anau						Y		N									1	Not given	OO
1515	21.06.03	Titirangi	Auckland	Family (5 members)			Y				OC			1		1	1			1	N	OO
1516	21.06.03	Waiuku	Auckland				Y				O			1	1		1			1	N	OO
1517	21.06.03	RD3 Tutukaka	Whangarei	Reel Passion Charters (Managing director)			Y				O			1		1	1			1	N	OO
1518	21.06.03	Parnell	Auckland				Y				N									1	Y	QS
1519	21.06.03		Tauranga				Y				OC			1			1			1	N	OO
1520	22.08.03	Browns Bay	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1						N	QO
1521	21.06.03	Lynfield	Auckland				Y				OC			1		1				1	N	OO
1522	21.06.03	Bethlehem	Tauranga				Y				OC			1	1					1	N	OO
1523	21.06.03	Riverside	Whangarei				Y				OC	1		1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1524	21.06.03	Drury	Drury	Kawakawa Bay Boating Club (Member)			Y				OC			1	1		1			1	Y	QO
1525	21.06.03	Avondale	Auckland				Y				OC			1						1	N	OO
1526	21.06.03	RD1	Te Awamutu				Y				OC			1		1	1	1		1	N	OO
1527	21.06.03	Howick	Auckland				Y				OC			1	1					1	N	OO

Not the size in question. Maybe look at other areas that are more accessible only to large craft and commercial operations. Concerned about DOC not doing anything to clean koi carp out of NZ waterways.	All			Option 4
We require the rights of New Zealanders to fish where we like and not to be told where to go.	All			Option 4
Why have a reserve that is hard to visit and hard for DOC to police? Why not utilise the no fish zone off Awana & organise permanent moorings for dive operators?				Option 4
Degradation - marine reserve would not help. The estuary must be managed locally. DOC should first analyse existing reserves. If they are degrading, they are unsustainable and so a network of them will also be unsustainable. DOC must accept that they are not welcome on GBI.				Option 4
It bans me from pursuing my leisure activity & will be of no benefit to me or my family.				Option 4
I do not fish in this area but am concerned at the process DOC is using, ignoring rights of people using GBI by not holding public meetings in Auckland. Marine reserves should not be set up illogically as was done at the Poor Knights, where it would be more sensible to have the Southern Island protected & the Northern Island with the limits that were already in place. This would have enabled comparisons to be made in some areas.				Option 4
I want to know what I would be saying yes to - what sort of reserve, how big, where etc? Tell us what you are trying to do and save and where you need to save it. The DOC questionnaire is a stacked one.				Option 4
DOC cannot be trusted. Why don't you consult with the biggest representatives of recreational fishers such as Option 4 and the Big Game Fishing Council? Show some real facts for your reasons. Reserves are a good idea but you do not consult with the right people about where they should be.				Option 4
Too many reserves now, no shelter for boats to fish safely in all weather if reserve went ahead. We will not benefit, the Poor Knights has shown that. If DOC really cared about the marine environment, why don't they clean up the oil leak coming from Niagra wreck near Hen & Chickens Islands? Divers do more damage to underwater environment through the introduction of foreign bodies such as sunscreens, oxygen, chemicals etc. This is shown by lack of black coral in Poor Knights reserve, it is only found outside.	All			Option 4
Why not publish a complete map of NZ with the areas that DOC would like to have as marine reserves? Let's see a long-term plan.				Option 4
Do not support proposal because of your poor research into how marine reserves will affect fisheries. Your approach to the whole fisheries is all wrong.				Option 4
Too large & not being able to travel through it with fish on board caught outside reserve. Can't see benefit in this proposal but see smaller reserves being of advantage.				Yes
Weather and location of the area mean it is its own marine reserve. I don't think I will benefit.		All		Option 4
Because reserve at Mayor Island is a waste of time, there are never any divers there and cheats still fish it.	All	All		Option 4
Prevents charter operators like me taking customers there for their pleasure, food and enjoyment. No need for area to be a reserve as it is difficult to get to & that protects the area. Commercial quota fishing could be prevented but there is no need to prevent others from enjoying area. I operate a charter launch & often take people to this area. My trips are between 1 day & 1 week & we live off the sea during longer trips. There is an abundance of fish in area.				Option 4
Make area closed to commercial, and closed season for all. I don't believe totally closing the area is the answer to any problems. The reason our seas are depleted has a lot to do with commercial fishers & over-fishing. It should be a commercial no-take area, have a closed fishing season & reduce bag limits & sizes of fish caught by recreational fishers. Need to look at whole area not just one small reserve. A huge overhaul of fisheries is needed.				Option 4
The amount of fish harvest from recreational fishing would have no adverse effects on the local fish population. Stopping commercial fishing in this area would do the fish stocks the most good. I can't see any benefits to me or my family. We wouldn't go there if we couldn't fish.				Option 4
It depends on the rationale for a reserve.				Option 4
Don't put a marine reserve where people fish. There are plenty of other areas where marine reserves could be located, even not close to the shore. Fish will breed in plenty of areas that are not prime recreational fishing areas. Fair & reasonable catch restrictions are a better way to protect fish. Fishing in the Gulf has improved over recent years so is a reserve necessary?				Option 4

1528	21.06.03	Glenfield	Auckland					Y										OC			1	1						1	N	OO
1529	22.08.03	Milford	Auckland					Y										OC			1				1				N	OO
1530	21.06.03		Paihia					Y										OC			1				1			1	N	OO
1531	21.06.03	RD3 Silverdale	Auckland					Y										OC			1	1			1			1	N	OO
1532	21.06.03	Whangaparaoa	Auckland					Y										O			1	1	1					1	N	OO
1533	21.06.03	Milford	Auckland					Y										OC			1	1						1	N	OO
1534	21.06.03	RD 4, Albany	Auckland					Y										O			1							1	N	OO
1535	21.06.03	Opotiki	Bay of Plenty					Y										OC			1							1	N	OO
1536	21.06.03	Remuera	Auckland					Y										OC			1	1			1			1	N	OO
1537	21.06.03	Campbells Bay	Auckland					Y										OC			1	1						1	N	OO
1538	21.06.03		Auckland				Y											OC			1	1			1			1	N	OO
1539	21.06.03	Albany	Auckland					Y										OC			1	1			1			1	N	OO
1540	21.06.03	Kerikeri	Bay of Islands					Y										O			1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1541	21.06.03		Auckland					Y										OC			1							1	N	OO
1542	21.06.03	Flagstaff	Hamilton				Y											O			1				1			1	N	OO
1543	21.06.03		Palmerston North					Y										OC			1				1			1	N	OO
1544	21.06.03	RD5	Papakura					Y										OC			1							1	N	OO
1545	21.06.03	Westharbour	Auckland					Y										O			1		1					1	N	OO
1546	21.06.03	Papamoa	Tauranga					Y										OC			1		1					1	N	OO
1547	21.06.03	Ponsonby	Auckland					Y										O			1							1	Y	QS

We as kiwis should have the right to put a meal on our table of fresh fish. I feel that no one has the right to tell anyone where they can or cannot fish. We should be keeping an eye on commercial fishers. Why should we all be punished for the few that want to break the law and take more than their limit?				Option 4
Not needed, the area is not over fished & quota system is sufficient control together with amateur fishing regulations. TV & newspaper reports say GBI locals are supportive - this is a lie as we know of meetings where nearly 100% of people opposed the reserve.		All		Yes
Not needed. Not proven as required or beneficial.				Option 4
I would like to think that this area will be available to all people to fish dive and enjoy. I really feel that DOC would like to turn half our coast into reserve and leave no place for the recreational fisher.				Option 4
The Barrier is so remote from the masses that recreational fishing has no impact at all. No real benefits to anyone other than DOC employees. Conservation is not about exclusion but about management. The pressure on the area at present is low and the area will be more impacted if it becomes a reserve e.g. the impact from divers - 10,000 divers visit the Poor Knights each year.				Option 4
There is no scientific evidence that I would benefit. It is time DOC acted as a responsible organisation.				Option 4
Not given.				Option 4
Too big an area.				Option 4
Keep it as it is.				Option 4
Human usage is too infrequent.				Option 4
Should be smaller area of complete ban and larger area of commercial ban. Also, you should consult more thoroughly.				Option 4
This would be irreversible and the need for its establishment is unclear. A benefit has not been shown to anyone. Not convinced that it will achieve results targeted. The irreversible creation of restrictions in this way is poor management & will unnecessarily restrict usage in perpetuity.				Option 4
DOC has abused our trust and support in past (e.g. the Poor Knights). There are many recreationally significant areas that local fishers need to be consulted over. The Goat Island reserve is an ideal model - marine reserves should be small & Goat Island is successful & is policed by local recreational fishers. Does DOC concede that humans have been part of the marine ecology for thousands of years & have been responsibly harvesting for this time? How can a reserve be in its natural state if part of the marine food chain has been removed?				Option 4
I am happy to reduce catch limits or change quotas.				Option 4
GBI is far enough away from centres of population to allow nature to be self regulatory. The beauty of the island & its waters should be available to all. This proposal will not benefit my family at all.				Option 4
It is interfering with nature. Ban trawlers.				Option 4
It will severely restrict options of recreational fishers. We don't need it, the relative isolation of area is sufficient.	All	All		Option 4
Do not protect the area from Needles through to Arid Island as this is an ideal recreational zone that already has a good sustainable ecosystem. It is not necessary to lock out current users.		Areas 2, 3 & 5.		Option 4
Manageable marine parks are a better way to go. What are you trying to protect - there is no real evidence that marine reserves increase fish numbers in nearby areas. All it does is put more pressure in nearby areas - the Mayor Island one is a classic, fishing outside reserve is no better than 10 years ago, and inside reserve divers say there are more maomao and rock cod but no more snapper or kingfish than before. Who is going to enforce the reserve?				Option 4
I support a marine reserve but not 12 miles out and not just around the corner which is easily accessible by recreational fishermen. Maybe further around Arid Island where only commercial fishermen go. People need to be consulted properly before major decisions are made like this proposal.			Area 5.	Option 4

1548	21.06.03	Te Atatu Peninsula	Auckland						Y										OC	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	Y	QO
1549	22.08.03	Murrays Bay	Auckland					Y											O			1		1	1					N	OO
1550	31.07.03	Gulf Harbour	Auckland																Not given			1	1	1						N	QO
1551	22.08.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland					Y											O			1	1		1					N	OO
1552	31.07.03	Titirangi	Auckland					Y											O						1				1	N	OO
1553	31.07.03	Titirangi	Auckland					Y											O						1					N	OO
1554	31.07.03	Hillsborough	Auckland						Y										N											N	OO
1555	31.07.03	Western Springs	Auckland						Y										OC			1		1						N	OO
1556	31.07.03		Great Barrier Is				Y	Y											O	1		1		1	1					N	QO
1557	27.07.03	Kauaeranga Valley RD2	Thames						Y										OC			1	1	1	1					Y	S
1558	22.07.03	Pukekohe	Auckland						Y										OC						1				1	N	OO
1559	22.08.03	Albany	Auckland						Y										OC			1		1						N	OO
1560	26.07.03	Northcote	Auckland					Y											OC			1		1		1	1	1	Y	QO	
1561	28.07.03	Snells Beach	Warkworth						Y										OC			1		1	1	1			1	N	OO
1562	29.07.03	Otumoetai	Tauranga						Y										OC			1	1	1					1	N	OO
1563	29.07.03	Kelston	Auckland					Y											OC			1							1	N	OO
1564	29.07.03	Albany	Auckland	Albany Sportfishing Club (Secretary)					Y										OC			1							1	N	OO
1565	29.07.03	Clevedon	Manukau						Y										O			1	1						1	N	OO
1566	30.07.03	Henderson	Auckland						Y										O			1	1		1				1	N	OO
1567	30.07.03	Plimmerton	Wellington						Y										OC			1							1	N	OO
1568	30.07.03	Meadowbank	Auckland						Y										OC			1		1					1	N	OO
1569	30.07.03	Northcote	Auckland						Y										O	1		1	1	1	1				1	N	OO
1570	31.07.03	Waikite Valley	Rotorua						Y										OC			1	1	1					1	Y	QO

By stopping commercial fishing & managing marine stocks better there will be something left for everyone, including our children. People should still be able to gather fish in the estuary, especially the locals who rely on this area for food. An open discussion is required on this matter. Marine reserves are in the interests of everyone so everyone needs to have an option to be involved. Already I have restrictions on netting where my bach is to save Hector's Dolphin, though no recreational fisherman has ever caught one. Don't lock up the coast without understanding the impacts.	All			Option 4
Because the recreational fisher is the [not] one that is raping the fishing stocks, the Barrier is a long way & is not visited by many fishermen and that makes a natural reserve of its own.	All	All		Yes
Not against marine reserves but only see merit in creating small reserves for scientific reasons or protection of unique habitats like Leigh & Poor Knights. Huge reserves are just stupid. Need to manage resources & this doesn't mean closing off large areas.				Letter
Recreational fishing does not deplete stocks. Stop commercial fishing & see great results. We do not agree with a marine reserve. Uses areas 1 & 3.				Yes
No benefit.	All	All		Yes
No benefit.	All	All		Yes
I oppose a marine reserve in this area.		All		Yes
Leave it for recreational fishing. Not needed.				Yes
Do not support a marine reserve but do support some form of improved conservation measures. I propose a series of voluntary conservation measures e.g. reduced catch limits, increased size limits, restrictions on fishing methods, bans during spawning season. Commercial fishing should be excluded.				Email
Not given.				Email
Proposal will unnecessarily restrict the rights of NZ citizens to benefit from the resources of GBI. There should be no marine reserve.	All	All		Option 4
I would be unable to travel in this area or anchor in bays overnight while in possession of fish which was caught outside the reserve. Uses areas 3, 4, 5 & 7,				Yes
Offshore areas that are more than 4 miles should have limited protection. The concept is flawed as DOC has no baseline. There should be lengthy period of research in area prior to shutting it off from fishing. A large reserve is a little unwise & habitat in area is fairly homogenous & there is nothing unique in area. More benefit in having a smaller reserve. The remoteness of area offers some protection already. Ecotourism is not going to thrive if a marine reserve is made.				Option 4
This area is one of few quality land-based fishing spots in Gulf due to many no-landing islands. Area is also under fished recreationally. Policing Goat Island has proved to be a problem & a lot of people will not respect this proposed reserve.				Option 4
Plenty of fish life in area. Reduced bag limit would address any future problems.				Option 4
Enough reserves already.				Option 4
It not easy to get to due to weather & when it is right I like to get round there for a fish.				Option 4
Area is too remote with only boat access to most of it & to encourage visitors to area like this in small boats is dangerous & irresponsible. Fish life in area is abundant & don't see how a reserve would further enhance this. Estuary should be excluded. Even in settled weather don't see many recreational vessels in this area. We fail to see how recreational fishers could ever have any detectable effect on marine life in this area.	All			Option 4
There are enough reserves. Why not just expand areas that are already reserves & police them harder?				Option 4
Excellent fishing.				Option 4
Sufficient reserves already.				Option 4
It would be impossible to police, poaching will be rife. Negligible pressure & anglers are generally conservationists anyway. Seafood is plentiful. As a member of Ngati Wai hapu I resent DOC imperialism & snubbing of my Article Two rights.		Area 2.		Option 4
Not given.				Option 4

1571	31.07.03	Silkwood Heights	Manukau	Ngati Porou			Y											1	1		Y	S
1572	31.07.03	Otauhu	Auckland	Forest & Bird - South Canterbury (ex Committee member)					Y	N			1								Y	S
1573	31.07.03	RD 1 Kaukapakapa	Auckland 1250				Y			O		1	1	1	1	1					N	OO
1574	31.07.03	Dairy Flat, RD 4	Auckland 1311				Y			O		1	1	1		1					N	OO
1575	31.07.03		Kerikeri 0470	Fish and Game (Ex Chair)				Y	Y	OC	1		1	1							N	OO
1576	31.07.03		Waiwera					Y		OC		1									N	OO
1577	31.07.03		Morrinsville					Y		OC		1									N	OO
1578	31.07.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				O	1		1	1	1	1					N	OO
1579	31.07.03	Howick	Auckland					Y		OC		1		1	1						N	OO
1580	31.07.03	Melbourne	Florida 32935				Y	Y		OC		1	1								N	OO
1581	31.07.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				OC		1	1								Not given	OO
1582	31.07.03	MBE N270	Auckland					Y		OC				1	1						Y	QS
1583	31.07.03	Private Bag	Palmerston North						Y	N											Y	S
1584	31.07.03	Howick	Auckland					Y		OC		1		1							N	OO
1585	31.07.03	RD 3	Putaruru					Y		OC		1		1							N	OO
1586	31.07.03		Huntly					Y		OC		1									N	OO

Longevity for coming ancestors.				Yes
Due to increasing population & better fishing methods there is a faster decrease in fish numbers. Few people are aware of how over fishing of one species, although it can increase numbers of some other species, upsets nature's balance. We need reserves to show young people how the abundance of fish in a no-take reserve compares to what is regarded as normal now. The more reserves there are the easier it will be to teach about the environment.				Yes & Letter
No benefit. Many people have enjoyed this area for many years. Why spoil it with rules and regulations?	All	All		Yes
I feel it is my right to enjoy nature & my right to fish & dive etc with my children. Fishing is in our culture & time & money would be better spent on pollution control and awareness.	All	All		Yes
There is enough foul ground to act as a natural reserve. It is the birthright of every New Zealander to fish and gather. This proposal will not benefit me as a 6th generation New Zealander. Public lands are just that, all people should be able to use them recreationally just not commercially.	All	All		Yes
It will ruin the area for recreational purposes. Police daily catches by all means, and keep commercial guys out but don't ruin the area for recreational fishing purposes with a reserve.				Yes
Want to continue fishing there with my children as has been the case since time began. Marine reserves are a waste of time, need to keep commercial enterprises out and police recreational catches.				Yes
As a person born on this island it is important for me to be able to gather food where I want to. I like cockles, pipis, green lipped mussels etc. It will be of no benefit but a restriction on my food gathering which helps to feed me.	All	Area 2.	Cuvier Island, Little Barrier Island, Mokohinau Islands.	Yes
What is endangered or threatened in this area? It is an isolated area and is therefore protected to some extent. Benefits will be that there will be more fish to look at during certain times of the year. Due to isolation, there is limited benefit of a reserve. The pipi and cockle beds in estuary are the only ones accessible from mainland. I don't think the reserve needs to be so large. A reserve is not practical as the area includes the only safe anchorages in westerly winds. This area is one of the few proper fisheries close to Auckland. Questionnaire is biased.	Part	Areas 5, 6 & 8.	Areas 2, 3, 4 & 7.	Yes
I get great pleasure from fishing & boating when visiting my friends on the island & would not like to see their traditional approach to enjoying the spectacular resource & environment curtailed in this way. Ban all commercial fishing & enforce bag limits. Allow unrestricted boating access. More use of honorary rangers. Take note of locals opinions.	All			Yes
It will affect the fishing and food gathering for a significant group of locals. Ban commercial fishing in Gulf & enforce recreational bag limits.	All	All		Yes
No personal benefits but will benefit the island & Gulf, will offer protection of representative examples of marine habitat, provide healthy environment. Tangata whenua should be allowed customary right to take shellfish from estuary - protection could be mataitai. Some offshore areas I would rather see as a marine park. Not totally convinced a large marine reserve is a good idea. There are many different protection methods & a blended approach is a good idea.	Part for iwi	Areas 6 & 8 a marine park. Area 4 a taiapure or mataitai.	Areas 2, 3, 5 & 7.	Yes
NZ is an island, the sea and the life in it is a part of the nation's natural heritage that must be protected from the negative impact of human activities.				Yes
Recreational activities do little to damage the ecosystem. Commercial activity does so ban it. Allow recreational use with quotas. Why 10% of our coastline for reserves?				Yes
I believe it is my right as a New Zealander to harvest kaimoana in accordance with the fishing regulations. All of the North-eastern coast should be excluded.	All	All		Yes
What is on the north-eastern coast that is no where else in the Gulf? You have not identified one species of anything that is in danger. DOC seem more concerned about effects than the cause. Need to eliminate sediment run-off first. If fish stocks are the problem, eliminate commercial fishing.				Yes

1587	31.07.03	Remuera	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1	1				Y	QO
1588	31.07.03	Whitianga	Coromandel	Forest & Bird (Chair)							Not given										Y	S
1589	23.06.03	TikiPunga	Whangarei	Northern Public Sector NZ Recreational Fishing Council (Elected representative)				Y			O			1		1	1			1	N	QO
1590	31.07.03	Mt Albert	Auckland					Y			OC			1							N	OO
1591	31.07.03	Greenhithe	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1	1				N	QO
1592	31.07.03	Takapuna	Auckland					Y			OC			1	1	1	1				N	QS
1593	31.07.03	RD	Warkworth	Warkworth Gamefish Club (President)				Y			OC			1	1		1				N	OO
1594	31.07.03		Warkworth					Y			O			1						1	Y	QS
1595	31.07.03	Mt Eden	Auckland					Y	Y		OC									1	Y	S
1596	31.07.03		Whitianga	Mercury Bay Ocean Sports Club (President)				Y			O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1597	31.07.03	RD 1	Mangonui 0557	OSNZ (Co-ordinator, Far North) & Doubtless Bay Marine Protection Group (Member)				Y		Y	OC				1		1			1	Y	S
1598	31.07.03	RD 1 Waimaukaku	Auckland					Y			O			1	1						N	OO
1599	31.07.03	Parnell	Auckland					Y		Y	OC			1	1						Y	S
1600	31.07.03	Papamoa	Bay of Plenty					Y			OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO

Support a reserve but not adjacent to the land. I spend about 1-2 weeks in area per year. If the reserve was properly located it might improve adjacent recreational fishing. I think the estuary would be a good reserve. The sea adjacent to the land is ideal for recreational fishing so choose areas inhospitable to boats. Concerned about advertising of meetings - thinks it was lacking. Thought the meetings were too ad hoc & each attendee should receive a transcript of each meeting. Believes DOC has made a firm decision about proposal area & that views will not be changed.	None	Areas 3, 4 & 5.	Part of area 5 & 6.	Yes & letter
We would like to support your proposal in its entirety & look forward to viewing a formal application in due course. We have Te Whanganui A Hei marine reserve in our area and it provides essential protection for our valuable marine resources and ensures impacts from recreational and commercial fisheries are minimised.				Letter
There is no scientific proof to validate reserve creation. There must be areas available in estuary for the collecting of shellfish for the general public. All areas of Barrier are important to me as they are areas where the public can access their individual recreational quota.	Part	All		Option 4
No evidence that I have seen that satisfies me it is necessary or beneficial to the wider community. Public consultation and notification has been poor.	All	All		Yes
In favour of a smaller reserve. Would benefit if recreational fishing and diving for recreational quotas of scallops were allowed.		Areas 1, 2, 4 & 5.		Yes
There would be benefits but reduce size of reserve. Restrict areas of estuary where shellfish are most vulnerable. In favour of a reserve but not so big.	Part	Areas 2, 4 & 5.		Yes
As our prevailing winds are south west it will take away our only sheltered fishing and anchorages in the area.				Yes
Try the south end as the north end has the best shelter and is so handy to Fitzroy. The best idea is to make the cable area right through the Gulf a reserve. No reserve anywhere north of Arid Island, including the island.		Areas 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.	Areas 6 & 8.	Yes
Preserving an area that is unique in NZ landscape. In regards to Estuary, could have a small area available that would change every 3-5 years (rotate usage) for customary fishing, as at Rarotonga. Those using area have an interest in preserving larger area.	Part			Yes
Mercury Bay club has 1641 members. We are not prepared to support a proposal of this size and not prepared to support any other non-specific proposal. The club members will not benefit from this proposal. The estuary should all be excluded as is only such estuary on the whole island. The area is already protected by the weather and by recreational and commercial fishing regulations. Proposed area too large. The timing of proposal is premature. For safety reasons alone the western side of Arid Island should never be part of a proposed reserve.	All	All		Yes
Estuary - in favour of limited local collection as long as brown teal roosts not disturbed. After seeing underwater map in favour of extending reserve out to full 12 miles.	Part for iwi & locals	None		Yes
Area is our traditional boating and fishing area, leave as is. Close inshore areas to commercial fishers but leave open to recreational users.		Inshore areas.		Yes
Protection of our national resources for all New Zealand's future generations is fundamental. Current degradations in coastal areas make protection mandatory in the most effective, uncompromising fashion with severe penalties applied for environmental degradation. Strongly believe that as far as possible GBI should be given full protective status. It is a national treasure & ideally should have National Park status.				Yes
Due to location and exposure, not at risk from over use. If any restrictions at all should just be commercial take.	All	All		Yes

1601	3.07.03	Wellesley St	Auckland	Auckland City Council (Chairperson of City Development Committee)																	Not given												Y	QS
1602	31.07.03	Torbay	Auckland 1311																			Y	N										N	OO
1603	31.07.03	Manukau City	Auckland					Y														O			1			1					N	OO
1604	31.07.03	Beachlands	Auckland					Y														O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
1605	31.07.03	Remuera	Auckland						Y													OC			1	1	1	1					N	OO
1606	31.07.03	Onehunga	Auckland					Y	Y													OC	1			1			1			1	N	OO
1607	31.07.03		Whangamata					Y														O	1		1	1							N	OO
1608	31.07.03	Campbells Bay	Auckland					Y														O	1		1	1	1	1					Y	QS
1609	31.07.03	RD 2	Huntly							Y												OC			1	1	1	1				1	Y	QS
1610	31.07.03	Manurewa	Auckland							Y												OC			1	1	1	1					N	OO
1611	31.07.03	Botany Town Centre	Auckland						Y													O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
1612	31.07.03	RD 4	Hamilton						Y													O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
1613	31.07.03		Morrinsville						Y													O			1			1	1				N	OO
1614	31.07.03	Glenfield	Auckland						Y													O			1	1	1						N	OO
1615	31.07.03	Torbay	Auckland					Y	Y													O			1				1				N	OO
1616	31.07.03	Papakura	Auckland						Y													O			1	1	1	1					N	OO
1617	22.08.03	Ellerslie	Auckland						Y																1	1			1				N	OO

(1) Council supports proposal in principle. (2) Council & DOC should work together for eco-tourism opportunities to materialise from reserve. (3) The concerns of GBI community & the need to establish a joint management approach between DOC & ACC could be developed by establishing a Memorandum of Understanding. (4) The proposal offers oppourtunities for economic growth. (5) Council believes the current use of the estuary is low impact & sustainable & would support an introduction of community based initiatives e.g. taiapure. (6) DOC needs to further consider any social or economic impacts from the proposal on local residents along the adjacent coast. (7) Council suggests an advisory group be established, comprising representation from GBI Community Board, local community & Ngati Rehua. (8) Council requests that DOC approach the Ministry of Fisheries to seek further control over fisheries management in Hauraki Gulf.	Part			Letter
I cannot see how it will benefit the people of NZ. I do not support the government's target of the protection of 10% of NZ's marine environment with marine reserves. The control of commercial operators will achieve most of the aims of this policy. DOC states that it is not aiming to manage fisheries but 4 of the 8 stated benefits of marine reserves in the DOC information booklet relate to preserving fish stocks & species. The ecosystem includes all living things & the taking of fish may therefore influence the natural order but I do not beleive recreational fishing in this area is at such a level to unduly influence this. The submission form appears to give weight to people who frequent the area, and I in fact initially believed I was not qualified to complete it. The ordinary New Zealander does go fishing & to take this opportunity away or to make it more difficult would be wrong. Managing, not banning, fishing in an area is surely the answer.		All		Yes & letter
Objection to loss of freedom to fish in favourite areas. Area on east side already taken out of fishing is sufficient. Further objection to secondary restrictions imposed in reserve areas.		All		Yes
The north east coast has the best fishing in the world. Commercial fishing could perhaps be limited				Yes
Don't believe a marine reserve is necessary to protect marine stocks or habitats. I have regularly visited the area in the past 20 years - the area is important to me & I want to be able to continue to fish & dive. I have never abused my right to go fishing. I believe we need to look at the real reasons the area is being impacted e.g. commercial fishing, before people like myself are shut out from our favourite fishing spots. I'm very careful to only catch what I need and if the area becomes a reserve I will stop visiting.	All			Yes & Letter
My bach is on the north east side, at Awana. The reserve would not benefit anyone as it is a good recreational fishing place. There are enough reserves already.				Yes
There are enough reserves already, but if necessary make only a very small area so that people like me can enjoy our fishing.				Yes
Support a small reserve only e.g. Arid would be okay.		Areas 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 & 8.	Area 5.	Yes
Fish stocks would be encouraged to build up, enhancing fishing in the future. The estuary should either be all in or all out - keep it simple. The proposed area could be a bit smaller e.g. not include Arid Island to the Needles from coast to 1-2 miles out. We suggest a marine reserve at Little Barrier Island as it is already a land reserve & also controls on commercial fishing.	None	Areas 3 & 5.	Areas 2, 4, 6, 7 & 8.	Yes
Far too large an area to put into reserve & its isolation protects it. Why not move the commercial ventures out before penalizing the whole population of recreational fishers?	All	All		Yes
Area is too large. There will be no benefit to us.	All	All		Yes
I do not support 10% reserve policy. Limited access to proposed area means little use of marine reserve by greater population.		All		Yes
The proposed area penalises people who cannot get there often, because of weather, time etc. Area is not always accessible, therefore is not hammered.	All	All		Yes
I want to be able to use this area for pleasure and don't want it as an ornament. What is the point of having reserves e.g. Poor Knights as nobody gets to enjoy them?	All	All		Yes
Why not a reserve at Medlands to join up with Navy area?			Medlands & Navy area.	Yes
This is one of the best boating, fishing and diving places on the east coast & must be left open for all boat and fishing persons to enjoy. I have been visiting for 35 years. Don't think there would be any benefit in having a reserve.	All	All		Yes
Not given.				Yes

1618	31.07.03	Herald Island	Auckland				Y													N	OO								
1619	31.07.03		Te Aroha				Y													Y	QS								
1620	31.07.03	Omaha, RD 6	Warkworth				Y													N	OO								
1621	Undated	St Heliers	Auckland				Y													1	N	OO							
1622	31.07.03	Pakuranga	Auckland					Y														N	OO						
1623	31.07.03	RD 1	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y																N	OO					
1624	31.07.03	Ferntown RD 1	Collingwood 7171						Y														1	Y	S				
1625	31.07.03	Ferntown RD 1	Collingwood 7171	Forest & Bird - Golden Bay branch (Secretary)						Y															Y	S			
1626	31.07.03	Auckland Central	Auckland Central				Y																			N	QO		
1627	31.07.03		Ngongotaha				Y																				N	OO	
1628	31.07.03	Te Atatu South	Auckland				Y																				Y	S	
1629	31.07.03	Auckland Central	Auckland Central				Y			Y																		N	OO
1630	31.07.03	Albany	Auckland	Albany Game Fishing Club (Member)				Y																				N	OO
1631	31.07.03	Takapuna	Auckland				Y																					N	OO
1632	31.07.03		Auckland 2	Greenpeace (Executive Director)				Y		Y																		Y	QS
1633	31.07.03	Newton	Auckland				Y																					Y	S
1634	31.07.03	Pt Chevalier	Auckland				Y																					Y	S

Do not support proposal because: (1) This is the area where we would prefer to go fishing in south-westerly weather. (2) It is totally unacceptable to be denied free right of way through this area when in transit around island, if carrying fish or bait on board. The area is exposed to bad weather & should not be a reserve. In addition, there are too many mussel farms encroaching in areas used by the boating public at GBI.		All		Yes
I will not benefit because the area will not be policed. The reserve proposal is too large. The only benefit is to commercial fishing, as fish numbers increase more quota will be sold.		Areas 3, 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 2, 4 & 5.	Yes
I do not have the right to pass through or safely anchor in a reserve if I have fish on board. I want to keep my "rights" as a kiwi to fish.				Yes
I spend a lot of time in this area & it is already treated like a reserve, very few boats venture to the outside. But we can still recreationally fish & dive. A marine reserve is not needed as the elements protect it already.	All	All		Yes
DOC are trying to put reserves all over the Gulf. Soon we will not be able to go fishing at all.				Yes
Because conservation should be practiced i.e. wise use & management of resources. I feel that DOC neither has the resources nor the competence to administer this proposal. The area should be controlled by the Ministry of Fisheries if necessary.	All			Yes
I believe this and other reserves are vital to protect our precious marine biodiversity. I will benefit in having the knowledge that my grandchildren can visit a protected and functioning marine reserve and enjoy observing underwater life as it can be.	None	None		Yes
We are very anxious to see that enough coastal areas, representative in type and diversity are preserved along all of NZ's coastline for biodiversity protection and regeneration. We appreciate DOC's willingness to promote this proposal & wholeheartedly endorse & support this proposal.				Yes
When can you present the facts and data supporting the need to have the whole area then maybe an area could be made into marine reserve. In DOC's last attempt to create a marine reserve, they stated that a large area wouldn't be manageable - what has changed? The estuary is a safe place to launch a boat & is only place to gather fish & shellfish in the north-east.	Part	Area 2 & out to Rakitu Island.		Yes
The size is the issue - come up with a better proposal with a justifiable cause. No benefit at all. Sort out the root cause of the snapper problem & I might benefit from that. The estuary is the only safe area in bad weather to gather a meal & teach others to take only what you need. Don't be greed - compromise and get buy in from public. Leave the inner area for traditional & recreational activities.	All	Area 2 extending out to Rakitu Island.		Yes
All New Zealanders will benefit. It is for the greater good & for the future. Benefits will also be for seafood stocks, tourism, conservation and preservation.				Yes
When DOC is honest & puts a researched proposal with data & facts for an area that is considerably smaller with a proper management plan, the I may reconsider. The estuary is used by the public, residents & will be used for future generations to gather fish & shellfish in the traditional manner, as has been done for over 100 years. The estuary is the only public access point to launch a boat. Support restrictions in estuary of no commercial fishing, no netting etc. Why not start with a more manageable sized reserve & increase size if there is a need for it?	Part	Area 2, extending out to Rakitu Island.		Yes
As a recreational fishing user of this area we would request/require the right of use of all areas, especially around GBI as this area provides excellent fishing for my purposes.	All	All		Yes
In essence I support the principle of marine reserves, however the position & size of this one is excessive. We should be targeting the tip of GBI or removing commercial fishers from within a certain distance from the coast. Recreational, responsible fishermen are not the ones doing the damage. If a marine reserve is created I will stop visiting GBI. I don't believe you are addressing the issue but are just upsetting residents and tourists. Clamp down on commercial fishing instead.	All	Areas 3 & 7.	Area 5 & area north-west of the Needles.	Yes
Protects ecosystems. In estuary would like to see mataitai status over an area explored and negotiated for shellfish take. General support for DOC effort to define and protect areas for reserve.	All as a mataitai			Yes
There will be better fishing just outside reserve - guaranteed forever. Include estuary as there are many other areas for taking shellfish. Excellent project to preserve & enhance this beautiful coast.	None			Yes
Regeneration of fish species will benefit us all. Marine reserves are an essential part of the society we live in where we over-use and disregard natural limitations of the eco-system.				Yes

1635	31.07.03	Kingsland	Auckland				Y			OC				1	1	1				Y	S
1636	31.07.03	Kingsland	Auckland				Y			OC						1				Y	S
1637	31.07.03	RD 3	Albany			Y				O			1		1					N	OO
1638	31.07.03	RD 3	Albany			Y				O			1		1					N	OO
1639	31.07.03	RD 3	Albany			Y				O			1		1					N	OO
1640	31.07.03	RD 3	Albany	Adi Kuila Seafaris (Skipper)		Y				O			1		1					N	OO
1641	31.07.03	Collingwood, 7171	Golden Bay						Y	N								1		Y	S
1642	31.07.03	Dominion Rd	Auckland			Y				OC					1					N	OO
1643	31.07.03	Glen Innes	Auckland			Y				O			1	1						N	OO
1644	31.07.03	Northcote	Auckland			Y				O	1		1	1	1					N	OO
1645	31.07.03	Devonport	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1646	31.07.03		Orewa			Y				O			1		1	1				N	OO
1647	31.07.03	Pakuranga Park Village	Pakuranga			Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1648	31.07.03	RD 1	Pokeno			Y				OC			1		1	1				N	OO
1649	31.07.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1650	31.07.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y	Y			Not given										Not given	OO
1651	31.07.03		Great Barrier Is		Y					O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1652	31.07.03	Whangaparapara	Great Barrier Is		Y					OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1653	31.07.03		Nelson				Y			OC			1			1				N	OO
1654	Undated		Great Barrier Is		Y					O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1655	Undated	Chapel St	Tauranga			Y			Y	O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1656	Undated	Papamoa	Mt Maunganui				Y			OC			1							N	OO
1657	Undated		Thames			Y				OC			1	1	1				1	N	OO

Reserves are not about personal benefit but about conserving the biodiversity that sustains all life. It is on this basis that I support marine reserves and the GBI proposal.	None			Yes
I would make the effort to snorkel there and be generally be relieved there was one more area that is not being over fished. Would prefer estuary no-take.	None	None		Yes
It is a comfortable area to fish and dive when the wind is from the north-west, west, south-west or south. It is a long way to go from Auckland to have the wind change.	All			Yes
It is an awesome place to go fishing and diving. We won't benefit.	All			Yes
It's a fantastic place to fish.	All			Yes
I take passengers to GBI to chase large fish and crayfish - it is my livelihood. If they can't catch any fish they wont go, no job for me.				Yes
Biodiversity conservation and incidental benefits to scientific knowledge, education, fisheries and amenity values. A reserve would greatly increase the chance that I might visit the area to enjoy. If the estuary & other parts of the proposed area merit marine reserve status then include them all. Don't repeat the mistake that happened at Whanganui Inlet, where I live, where a large part of the area was left out of the Tai Tapu marine reserve to appease a relatively small number of people with the mistaken belief they have the fundamental right to kill things everywhere.	None	None		Yes
Who benefits? There is no easy access to the site & no commercial fishing control in area. I won't benefit as my boat is too small. Commercially fishing may benefit if they fish illegally. The estuary includes the best pipi and cockle beds on the Barrier. DOC will not put up access to the reserve or upgrade the road so what is the point of a reserve if people cannot get there?	All	All		Yes
DOC has enough reserves and should concentrate more time on policing illegal activities.	None	All		Yes
The amount of recreational fishing is limited by weather and sea conditions. No benefit.				Yes
It will put out of bounds a wonderful cruising/fishing area and put more pressure on other areas. Our boat is slow and these anchorages are important.		Areas 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7.		Yes
I feel we have enough marine reserves elsewhere. I will not benefit. Leave our little piece of paradise alone so we all may enjoy the peace & tranquility.				Yes
It is our right to use this area. No benefit to me. Hands off the Barrier.	All	All		Yes
Support it only if it is a small area such as Goat Island e.g. a bay & headland comprising up to 0.5km coastline & no more than 1km out to sea. There are better ways to conserve fisheries e.g. raise the minimum size of fish caught.				Yes
This area is where we go game fishing and why shouldn't residents be able to go and get a feed of fish etc when needed?	All	All		Yes
Can DOC justify in reasonable terms why there is a need for the reserve?				Yes
There are other areas of concern in NZ. We respect our food, we live here for it. It seems that you want to take over the whole island.				Yes
I can think of hundreds of reasons why not, one is that the area is not in danger as are most of the areas around NZ. As locals, we don't want this to happen as it will really kill the Island when not necessary. Why not attack the trawlers & big fishing boats that I can see from my harbour?				Yes
Fishing for food. I have respect for sea life. A land/sea grab which does not support our fish for food.				Yes
Food, land grab, other places for marine reserves much more needed in NZ				Yes
Restricts access and transit with dive gear and fish onboard as part of our lifestyle living aboard our boat, fishing for sustenance etc. We live on board our yacht for months at a time around GBI. There are better locations for the purpose in our opinion e.g. Little Barrier Island. The area proposed is too greedy & would disadvantage too many ordinary Kiwis.				Yes
Hands off the lot.				Yes
It is a marine reserve in a way anyway as you can only get there when the weather is good. The fishing quota is working, leave it that way.	All	All		Yes & Option 4

1658	Undated	Blockhouse Bay	Auckland				Y												1	N	QO			
1659	16.06.03	Auckland Mail Centre	Auckland				Y														N	OO		
1660	Undated	Stanmore Bay	Whangaparaoa				Y														Y	S		
1661	Undated	RD6	Omaha 1241				Y															N	OO	
1662	Undated	RD2 Silverdale	Auckland				Y															N	OO	
1663	Undated	RD2	Matamata				Y															N	OO	
1664	Undated	RD 2	Waimauku 1250				Y															N	OO	
1665	Undated	Glenfield	Auckland				Y															N	OO	
1666	Undated	Castor Bay	Auckland				Y															N	OO	
1667	Undated	Birkenhead	Auckland				Y															1	N	OO
1668	Undated	Rothesay Bay	Auckland				Y																N	OO
1669	Undated		Orewa				Y																N	OO
1670	Undated	Albany	Auckland				Y																N	OO
1671	31.07.03	Birkenhead	Auckland				Y																N	OO
1672	31.07.03	Clevedon	RD2 Papakura				Y																N	OO
1673	31.07.03		Orewa				Y																N	QO
1674	31.07.03	Matakana	Warkworth				Y																N	QO
1675	Undated	Matakana	Warkworth				Y																N	OO

Would support proposal if scientific studies show increased fish stocks and breeding coming from this area. I thought most breeding was from inner harbours. As a diver I enjoy seeing areas such as Goat Island & the Poor Knights reserves. If there has to be a reserve in this area, the estuary would be okay. I can accept smaller reserves, possibly out 1-2km from shore as drawn on map.		Northern end of area 3, areas 5, 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 2, part of 3 & 4.	Yes
The quota system is the tool to regulate fish take, as well as no take during spawning seasons. We object to an organisation attempting to deny us the enjoyment of an area that is an inherited right. DOC should realise what people want instead of alienating themselves continually.	All			Yes
Not given.				Yes
No marine reserve at GBI. Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Yes & Form letter
The north-eastern coast of GBI is a special place for us to be able to catch a feed of fish. DOC are very narrow-minded & don't like people who like to catch a feed of fish.				Yes
DOC is too greedy, wanting to take a large area that my family has grown up visiting & enjoying. I have never seen enough boats there consistently enough to do any damage. The area marked for the reserve is the area we spend 70% of our time in when we are there. I would be happy with a smaller reserve in the area where we are not able to fish & anchor - the Navy area.	All	Areas 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.	Navy zone.	Yes
Weather and sea conditions protect it a lot of the time. If it goes to the 12nm limit no one will benefit. Part of this coast is already off limits because of the Navy area & closing it all will put a lot of pressure on western side of Barrier.		Areas 3, 4 & 5.		Yes
I enjoy the area and want to be able to continue to use it as I currently do.	All	All		Yes
Removes appeal and incentive to visit area. It is a treat to go there when weather is suitable.		All		Yes
Fishing and right of passage should be free for all. Whole idea is a money making venture.	All	All		Yes
I see little benefit & think it would be a liability to all in the future. Marine reserves sound good but don't work - they cost, they restrict, and have little advantage to fish or science. Nature will go its own way in the end so leave it as it is.	All	All		Yes
Area provides excellent recreational fishing and usage for the benefit of all recreational boaties and fishermen. Owing to usage, it may be better to turn the Mokohinau Islands into a commercial-free reserve as they have less public accessibility.				Yes
I do not want my right to fish in a responsible manner curtailed by a government department determined to push their own agenda onto the public. DOC is using scientific data & the green movement propaganda & doesn't wish much discussion against this. Why not look into different ideas to conserve fish stocks? The great majority of recreational fishers support conservation as we wish to be able to continue to fish. you risk non-compliance of people like me in existing reserves as we lose respect for the whole idea that you are trying to promote. I adhere to current fishing regulations - why not try to work with fishermen rather than closing their favourite fishing spots.				Yes
I visit the area 4-5 times per year. No change required as there is no problem in the area. The reserve will be a public nuisance & total waste of taxpayer money.	All	All		Yes
Not given.				Yes
Proposed area is used for recreational fishing by boating public. A marine reserve as proposed will prevent all who use it from even going there, with fish on board. Boaties need safe anchorages. There would be no reason left to go there for most. Perhaps having a smaller area would be a compromise. To make a reserve for scientific purposes is simply stealing if from the many to give to the few.				Yes
If must have a reserve take over Navy testing area. Don't think it matters whether estuary is protected as locals will ensure it is not over-fished. There is already a no-fishing & no-anchoring zone - can't DOC take that over? The north east coast provides shelter & DOC must look at safety issues for fishing families. Boats won't shelter in area if they have fishing gear or fish on board. Auckland region already has enough no fishing or anchoring zones. DOC should put more effort into policing boat ramps & shellfish beds for over fishing. Small reserves should be plotted all around the coast, not big chunks like this proposal.				Yes
Small reserves should be plotted along coastline, not big areas as in this proposal. Safety aspects such as people traveling further to fish, anchoring etc need to be considered.				Yes

1676	Undated		Warkworth				Y		OC	1		1			1				N	OO
1677	Undated		Matakana				Y		O			1							N	OO
1678	Undated	Omaha Beach, Rd 6	Warkworth 1241				Y		OC			1							N	OO
1679	Undated		Warkworth	Assassin Charters (Skipper)			Y		O			1	1	1	1	1	1		N	OO
1680	Undated	One Tree Hill	Auckland			Y	Y		Y	O	1		1	1	1	1			N	OO
1681	Undated	Waiuku	Auckland			Y	Y		O			1	1	1	1	1			N	OO
1682	Undated	Blockhouse Bay	Auckland					Y	OC			1	1						N	OO
1683	Undated	Parnell	Auckland	Option 4 (Spokesperson)	Y	Y	Y		O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1684	Undated	Whangaparaoa	Auckland 1463					Y	OC			1	1		1				N	OO
1685	Undated	Glenfield	Auckland				Y		OC				1						N	OO
1686	Undated		Orewa				Y		O			1	1		1				N	OO
1687	31.07.03	Glenfield	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1						N	OO
1688	Undated	Howick	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1						N	OO
1689	Undated	Mangere Bridge	Auckland				y		OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1690	Undated		Warkworth				Y		OC			1			1				N	OO
1691	Undated	RD 1	Warkworth				Y		O			1		1	1				N	OO
1692	Undated	Gulf Harbour	Auckland	Blue Water Safaris			Y		Y	OC				1	1	1		1	N	OO
1693	Undated	Makarahi	Kaukapakapa				Y		O			1		1	1				Y	OO
1694	Undated	Forrest Hill	Auckland				Y		O			1		1					Y	OS
1695	Undated	Torbay	Auckland				Y		OC			1	1						Y	OO

Not given.				Yes
There should be no commercial fishing except for the local fish shops.				Yes
I am a NZ citizen who likes the freedom of choice to fish where I want. Tell DOC to find something else to do. Forget the idea & save taxpayer money. Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.		All		Yes & Form letter
There is no need for a reserve in this area as the weather keeps boats out & you could not police it. There is no benefit for me or my family. This is the main area we fish & dive on our charters. A reserve here would break the family tradition of fishing and diving in area.	All	All		Yes
The question of support is very biased. I do not want a reserve because: (1) Your stated objectives are of replenishing fish stocks & preserving area for future generations. This does not stand scrutiny as the fish stocks is a result of commercial fishing & the fish do not spawn in the proposed area anyway. The poisoning of the sea is a serious problem - address this instead. (2) Reserve proposal ill conceived and proper consultation has not taken place. (3) Your proposal is biased as is the glossy brochure & questionnaire. It is not your duty to be biased in this manner.	All	All		Yes
I believe if you take out commercial fishing in this area it will create its own reserve.				Yes
I don't believe it is over fished by recreational fishing. No benefit as all other reserves only benefit DOC. Reserves should only be made in areas that are not accessible to common use e.g. Kermadec Islands.	All	All		Yes
I have lived on the island & will again & challenge you to define a resident. The question about support is cynical & biased. I won't benefit, use other mechanisms to achieve protection. Regarding the estuary, local/customary management that is enforced will be more than enough. Other questions are also biased.	All			Yes
Present regulations and fishing quotas should be sufficient if administered properly				Yes
It would interfere with our freedom to anchor and fish where we like. There are enough reserves as is & they are difficult to look after. DOC don't seem to be able to look after the areas they already have control over.	All	All		Yes
Freedom of activities is what NZ is about, this proposal must not be allowed to go to law. The area must be open for all to use. Freedom is what NZ is all about.	All	All		Yes
Disruptive for locals and visitors and not necessary as area is isolated.	All	All		Yes
We visit this area for recreational fishing etc 2-3 times a year				Yes
I am not anti-marine reserves - Goat Island is a great concept. The proposal area is one of the top snapper recreational spots in the country. Recreational fishing here can be managed efficiently through education, public awareness, catch and release policies. I feel a reserve here has an agenda which DOC is not being forthcoming with. I have no problem with the estuary being a reserve. I am surprised DOC has an interest in this area, knowing that it is an important recreational area. To rope off such a large area is surely of no benefit to the average Kiwi? We need better overall management of the entire NZ fishery.	None			Yes
This area has all the safe anchorages & we have to be able to stay here with fish on board. I will not benefit at all - ban netting & trawlers & fix the algal bloom.	All	All		Yes
There already is an effective reserve south which probably could be enlarged without too much opposition. All the best anchorages will be prohibited to people with fish on board. I have been enjoying Barrier since 1966 & no one has approached me in regards to this proposal. You don't have a majority of support.				Yes
This area is not subject to intense recreational use so it would be more sensible to create a reserve in the intensely exploited areas such as Fitzroy Harbour. The remote nature of the location is itself a natural low take sustainable resource. This is the least acceptable location for a reserve. Marine reserves should be the exception not the rule. Let's address areas being ravaged by commercial and recreational operators instead of the soft options as is being suggested.			Port Fitzroy & harbour.	Yes
Only support a reserve around Arid Island.	All	Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 & 8.	Area 5 (Arid Island & 0.5km around).	Yes
Support concept but not as extensive as proposed. Harotaonga is used as a safe overnight anchorage after fishing & diving so should be excluded.		Areas 3, 6 & 7 & Harotaonga Bay.		Yes
Will protect coast and environment for future generations. A smaller reserve that is managed seasonally may be better.				Yes

1696	Undated		Whangarei			Y				O					1														N	OO
1697	Undated	Henderson	Auckland			Y				OC					1														N	OO
1698	Undated	Whenuapai	Auckland			Y				OC			1		1	1													N	OO
1699	Undated	Te Atatu South	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1		1													N	OO
1700	Undated	Swanson	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1		1													N	OO
1701	Undated	Royal Heights	Massey				Y			O			1																N	OO
1702	Undated	Riverhead	Auckland							O			1																N	OO
1703	Undated	Te Atatu South	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1		1													N	OO
1704	Undated	Whenuapai	Auckland				Y			O			1	1															N	OO
1705	Undated	RD Muriwai Beach	Auckland				Y			O			1		1														N	OO
1706	Undated	RD Waitoki	Auckland				Y			O			1		1														N	OO
1707	Undated		Mangawhai				Y			O			1		1														N	OO
1708	31.07.03	RD2 Henderson	Auckland				Y			OC			1	1					1										N	OO
1709	31.07.03	Red Beach	Auckland				Y			O		1	1		1	1													N	OO
1710	31.07.03	RD1 Muriwai Beach	Waimauku 1250				Y			O			1		1														N	OO
1711	31.07.03	Helensville	Auckland				Y			O			1		1												1		N	OO
1712	31.07.03	Waiuku	Auckland				Y	Y		OC			1	1	1	1													N	OO
1713	31.07.03	Penrose	Auckland				Y	Y		O	1		1		1	1													N	OO
1714	31.07.03	Whangaparaoa	Auckland				Y			O			1			1													N	OO
1715	31.07.03	RD2 Pukekohe	Auckland				Y			O			1	1	1	1													N	OO
1716	31.07.03	RD2 Pukekohe	Auckland				Y			O			1	1	1	1													N	OO
1717	31.07.03	Pukekohe	Auckland				Y			O			1	1	1	1													N	OO
1718	31.07.03	RD3 Albany	Auckland				Y			O	1			1	1	1													N	OO
1719	31.07.03	Howick	Auckland				Y			O			1	1															N	OO
1720	31.07.03	Howick	Auckland				Y			O			1	1															N	OO

There are enough reserves in place, any more will cause an imbalance in the ecosystem. Stop wasting peoples' time, users of this area do not want a marine reserve.	All	All		Yes
Reserve will stop me doing the things I like. The area is protected by the distance from people & the elements.	All	All		Yes
Reserve will stop me doing the things I like. The area is protected by distance.	All	All		Yes
I feel the area protects itself via the elements. The proposal will disadvantage me & will not benefit wider community. At no time is the area under pressure. Why not have a reserve for 1km around Arid Island?	All		Area 5.	Yes
Area self protected by distance & elements & is not under pressure	All	All		Yes
Area is self preserving. Existing laws should be policed and reserve will be unnecessary.	All			Yes
Not given.				Yes
Not needed, self protecting. Area is protected by elements & distance from population.	All	All		Yes
Area is protected by the elements. We have laws to protect it as it is.		All		Yes
The quota system is working & fish stocks are improving all the time. A reserve would stop me doing the recreational activities I enjoy. Reserves are not a fisheries management tool. They should be small & put where people can easily get to and see tame fish. I would not go to GBI when I can go to Goat Island.	All	All		Yes
It is not needed. None of it should be protected, especially the waters too deep to dive.	All	All		Yes
It will impact on my fishing activities unnecessarily.	All	All		Yes
Not given.				Yes
This is one of my most visited areas. No benefits to me.				Yes
It is not needed.	All	All		Yes
I do not support proposal because: (1) We have quota systems - is this system not working? (2) If I have fish on board my boat it means I cannot stay overnight within this area & would have to dump my fish overboard. (3) Overseas research suggests no-harvest areas do not benefit fisheries management in 98% of stocks studied. (4) Marine reserves are not fisheries mgmt tools. The only benefit I can see is viewing fish via snorkeling which I can do at Kelly Tarltons.				Yes & letter
No benefits at all, would only put pressure on other areas on your assumption that the area is over fished. Nature does a good job as it can be a rugged coast for recreational fishers. Concerned about returning with boat through estuary with fish on board. I feel the area could be better managed with a quota system or by putting resources into managing what is already in place. Concerned that DOC is saying that locals support the proposal after attending a meeting.				Yes
Area is managed well with fishing quotas that are in place & working so marine reserve is not required. Have dived & fished in area for 25 years as well as rest of Hauraki Gulf & area is in far better state now than it was 15 years ago.	All	All		Yes
To travel 12nm around reserve is unsafe in certain conditions. If there has to be a reserve, make it the Navy testing area as this is already a no-go zone.	All	All	Navy zone.	Yes
As a reserve it is not accessible enough to the average person. No benefit. I would support whole of GBI out to 12nm being a marine park & protected from all commercial fishing. Increase size for some fishes & lower limit bag.	All	All		Yes
Unaffordable for the average kiwi to reach & use. No reserve but a marine park with no commercial fishing. I would like to think the area will always be open to me as a recreational kiwi.	All	All		Yes
Too big & too far away for visitors. A reserve no, a park yes.	All	All		Yes
Because of natural isolation there would be no benefit for a reserve & because of this isolation there is no need for a reserve. Creation of reserves limits access & adds pressure of fishing to other areas. Reserves are not in the public interest.				Yes
A marine reserve & no go zone will together totally destroy the pleasure of recreational boating in this area.				Yes
Limited amount of recreational fishing & boating along this coast together with no-go zone is totally unacceptable. A reserve would affect all pleasure boating which I believe within this area does not affect the marine habitat.				Yes

1721	22.08.03	Browns Bay	Auckland				Y													O				1	1	1	1							N	OO	
1722	31.07.03	Howick	Auckland				Y	Y												O	1			1	1	1	1							N	OO	
1723	31.07.03	Howick	Auckland				Y													O				1		1								N	OO	
1724	31.07.03	Half Moon Bay	Auckland						Y											OC				1	1	1	1							N	OO	
1725	31.07.03		Coromandel				Y	Y												OC			1	1										N	OO	
1726	31.07.03		Whangamata					Y												OC				1	1									N	OO	
1727	31.07.03		Warkworth					Y												OC				1	1	1	1				1			N	OO	
1728	31.07.03	New Lynn	Auckland					Y												OC				1	1	1	1							N	OO	
1729	31.07.03	London	United Kingdom				Y													OC					1		1							N	QO	
1730	31.07.03	Pukekohe	Auckland					Y												O				1	1		1							N	QO	
1731	31.07.03	Papakura	Auckland	Clevedon Cruising Club (Club Captain)				Y												OC				1	1	1	1								N	OO
1732	31.07.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y													OC	1			1										N	OO	
1733	31.07.03	Milford	Auckland					Y			Y									O				1	1	1	1								N	OO
1734	31.07.03	Mairangi Bay	Auckland					Y												OC				1	1	1	1								N	OO
1735	31.07.03	Manurewa	Auckland	Clevedon Cruising Club (Club Captain)				Y												OC				1	1	1	1								N	OO
1736	31.07.03	Whenuapai	Auckland					Y												O				1	1	1	1								N	OO
1737	31.07.03	West Harbour	Auckland	West Harbour Fishing Club (Secretary)					Y											OC	1			1										Y/N	OO	
1738	31.07.03	Belmont Court	Belmont						Y											OC				1		1								N	QO	
1739	31.07.03	Waiuku	Auckland			Y	Y	Y												O				1	1	1								N	OO	

It is an area well frequented by boaties in the right weather conditions for fishing, diving & overnight anchorage. Navy area already provides a good reserve.			Navy zone.	Yes
You already have too many. No benefit to me. Why have you not studied the Navy no fishing & anchoring zone?	All	All		Yes
Removes too many of the safe anchorages. No benefit to me. It would be illegal for us to anchor in Harotaonga or the cove at Arid Island with fish on board our boat if a marine reserve is created.				Yes
The weather makes the area self protecting. The Quota Management System also protects it. Proposed area takes up nearly all protected anchorages & fishing areas. Who is going to police it & make criminals of nearly 100% of the people passing through the area?				Yes
I would like to think this area is for all to use & enjoy with freedom, not just for a handful of scientists to play while the rest of us are excluded. There would be no benefits for me, it would just restrict my activities. If there is an exclusion area in the estuary, how would you be able to come out the estuary by boat with pipis & flounders on board?		All		Yes
This is a popular area with recreational fishers & should remain that way forever. No benefit at all.	All	All		Yes
There are already reserves like Goat Island & Takatu etc. No benefit to me & it could cost a life if you have to out to 12nm limit to go home if you have fish on board. The quota system & education we have seems to be working.	All	All		Yes
There are provisions in place for recreational users not to over fish the area. We already have a marine reserve on offshore islands & it would be more appropriate to select areas of coastline so everyone could enjoy it, not just boaties. Safe anchorages should be excluded from marine reserves.				Yes
There is no point as this area will not be over-fished due to the weather. If a reserve is necessary, have it at Little Barrier Island.			Little Barrier Island.	Yes
This coastline is often unavailable to recreational fishing because of strong westerly winds. We use at least 3 anchorages in proposed area & understand that it would be illegal to have fish on board boat while anchored in reserve. If a reserve has to happen, make it at the Navy zone.		All		Yes
This is the outer limit of my boat's range so with weather conditions permitting we can only access this area a couple of times per year. I can see no benefit in locking this area up as in prevailing westerly winds, this is the only area of shelter within many miles. Why don't you make Cuvier Island a reserve as that would not interfere with thousands of recreational boaties. DOC is arrogant trying to claim this area & are lying when they say the majority of GBI residents are in favour.	All		Cuvier Island.	Yes
Not given.				Yes
Why try to control everything, it is not over-fished & is remote enough for natural replenishment. Weather & sea conditions prevent overuse. In westerly winds entire area is our normal recreational range (boat, dive & fished both sides of GBI for 25yrs, 5-6 times per year for 4-10 days) & includes all safe anchorages & deep sea trolling areas.				Yes
Area far too large & would restrict too many people for very little gain. No one would benefit.				Yes
Holidays at Barrier. This area great to go in westerly winds. After 20 years of fishing in area I have not seen any decline in fish stock.		All		Yes
Area should be left as it is for all people, animals to use the great outdoors. Area has enough protection with regulations already in place. Proposal has no benefit for people of NZ. Ministry of Fisheries has enough areas for research. Any money available should be used to extend the 12 mile limit & look after it.	All	All		Yes
It is not required as its location prevents overuse. Why such a large area, who will police it? A stop should be put on all reserve proposals until proper scientific study & proper consultation as to where they should be situated, what is to be accomplished.				Yes
Powers that be do not have resources to manage area. No benefit. If a reserve is necessary have it in the estuary behind Whangapoua Beach or from southern end of Medlands to little island at north end of Rosalie Bay. It is a privilege to fish in NZ not a right.				Yes & letter
Too restrictive. DOC can't control what they already have. Reserve would put too much pressure on rest of GBI.		All		Yes

1740	31.07.03	Okupu	Great Barrier Is			Y	Y				O	1		1	1	1	1	1			N	OO
1741	31.07.03	Pakuranga	Auckland			Y	Y				O			1	1	1	1		1		N	OO
1742	31.07.03	Mt Albert	Auckland				Y		Y		O				1		1			1	N	OO
1743	31.07.03	Pukekohe	Auckland				Y				O			1		1					Y	QS
1744	31.07.03		Address in Maori	Ko Manaia Tuatahi, Ngatiwai, Nga Puhi, Waikato me Ngati Rehua, Nga Iwi o Nga Maatua Turipuna							Not given										Not given	OO
1745	31.07.03	Thorndon	Wellington					Y	Y		OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1746	Undated	RD5	Warkworth								Not given										N	OO
1747	Undated	RD6	Warkworth								Not given										N	OO
1748	Undated		Matakana								Not given										N	OO
1749	Undated	Point Wells	Warkworth								Not given										N	OO
1750	Undated		Omaha								Not given										N	OO
1751	Undated		Omaha								Not given										N	OO
1752	Undated	Point Wells	Warkworth								Not given										N	OO
1753	Undated	Matakana	RD3 Warkworth								Not given										N	OO
1754	Undated		Omaha								Not given										N	OO
1755	Undated	Glendowie	Auckland								Not given										N	OO
1756	Undated		Omaha								Not given										N	OO
1757	Undated		Omaha								Not given										N	OO
1758	Undated	Mt Roskill	Auckland								Not given										N	OO
1759	Undated	Omaha Beach	RD6 Warkworth								Not given										N	OO

I don't want DOC to misconstrue this as support for this project. Nothing needs protecting from recreational users. Areas concerned are better now than 10 yrs ago so leave it as is & it will continue to flourish.	All	All		Yes
The reserve will not fix any of the sea life problems.				Yes
Because area is owned by people of NZ & everyone should be able to enjoy the area. No one will benefit as it is just another way of DOC wanting to lock people of NZ out. DOC should stop spending taxpayers money on propaganda & start managing the land the way the people of NZ would want it.	All	All		Yes
Agree with reserve only if coastal diving & fishing is not restricted. Policing & management must be allocated prior to introduction. A more conservative approach to commercial fishing would achieve more benefits to fish stocks than a marine reserve. Coastal areas should be excluded. Would like to attend meetings if there are any in Franklin. I would agree to a marine park?	All	Coastal areas 2, 3 & 4.		Yes
Lack of consultation has resulted in proposal that has neither the support or input from Ngati Rehua as kaitiaki & most significant stakeholder. Ngati Rehua have harvested resources in estuary for centuries & continue to do so & many are reliant on these resources. People have shown themselves to be capable of enormous damage to biosphere. Ngati Rehua as kaitiaki should play a major role in stopping this. A partnership with people of the land in the mgmt of all our resources equal opportunity in mgmt, control, employment & monitoring is of utmost importance to Ngati Rehua.				Yes
Area doesn't need protection & reserve will only result in restricting access & usage to fantastic part of NZ. Will also restrict access for those carrying fish through area.	All	All		Yes
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'. Additional submission states: Because there are too many marine reserves now & you can't manage what you have got so why have more? Why does DOC waste our money & time - tell them to stop & let the fishermen manage any future marine reserves. What happens if I caught fish outside the area &, because of the weather, has to shelter on the north east coast? To legally enter, I would have to throw my fish overboard.	All	All		Yes & Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'. More consultation is definitely required.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter

1760	22.08.03	Titirangi	Auckland				Y													O				1	1	1	1							N	OO	
1761	22.08.03	RD2	Coromandel					Y												OC				1	1	1	1							N	OO	
1762	Undated		Omaha																	Not given														N	OO	
1763	Undated	Point Wells	Warkworth																	Not given														N	OO	
1764	Undated		Leigh																	Not given														N	OO	
1765	Undated		Leigh																	Not given														N	OO	
1766	Undated		Warkworth																	Not given														N	OO	
1767	Undated		Whangateau																	Not given														N	OO	
1768	Undated	Papatoetoe	Papatoetoe																	Not given														N	OO	
1769	Undated	RD6	Warkworth																	Not given														N	OO	
1770	Undated		Leigh																	Not given														N	OO	
1771	22.08.03	Northcote	Auckland				Y				Y									O				1	1	1	1								N	OO
1772	Undated	Not given	Not given																	Not given														N	OO	
1773	Undated	Milford	Auckland				Y													OC				1		1								N	OO	
1774	Undated	Pakuranga	Auckland																	Not given														N	OO	
1775	Undated		Matakana																	Not given														N	OO	
1776	Undated		Matakana																	Not given														N	OO	
1777	22.08.03		Kumeu				Y													O				1	1	1	1								N	OO
1778	Undated	RD6	Warkworth																	Not given														N	OO	
1779	Undated	Point Wells	Warkworth																	Not given														N	OO	
1780	Undated	Point Wells	Warkworth																	Not given														N	OO	

It will severely curtail the way in which I use this area. I do not believe the problem is with recreational fishing. There will be no benefit to me or the many other visitors I have brought to this area over the years.	All	All		Yes
Since the Navy already has an area that is a virtual marine reserve, a significant area is already available for scientific research. Not sure DOC could police such a large area. No benefit & will be a potential lawbreaker thanks to ill-thought-out legislation. We are astounded that each time a reserve is proposed here it grows bigger despite opposition.	All	All		Yes
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Because it covers the only safe anchorages on the eastern side & only place you can take shelter in most winds. The Whangapoua beach area is a popular place to anchor, swim & walk as well as enjoying a fresh seafood meal. Even if we caught seafood outside the reserve we could not enter the area with our catch. For us it is a multi-use area & if it is a reserve we will not be able to use it again. Apart from Christmas, I have never witnessed any concentrated recreational boating/fishing/diving activity in the area. The isolation & limited shelter provide significant barriers against use. Exclude all areas at least 5 miles from coast. If DOC are adamant they want a reserve, why have one that includes all anchorages?		Coastal areas 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.		Yes & letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Not required because remoteness protects habitat. There is no heavy recreational pressure. Commercial use could be restricted. No benefit as loss of boating & diving enjoyment of area.		All		Yes
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Incorrect use of a marine reserve i.e. to stop fishing not for scientific study - which could not practically be undertaken in an area this size. Empire building should never be allowed - waste of DOC budget. Why not try & use your resources to eradicate pests?	All	All		Yes
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter

1781	22.08.03	Royal Heights	Auckland				Y												OC			1	1	1	1					Y	QS	
1782	Undated	Point Wells	Warkworth																Not given												N	OO
1783	Undated		Omaha																Not given												N	OO
1784	Undated		Omaha																Not given												N	OO
1785	22.08.03	Westmere	Auckland				Y												O			1	1		1						N	OO
1786	Undated	RD6	Warkworth																Not given												N	OO
1787	Undated	RD6	Warkworth																Not given												N	OO
1788	Undated		Omaha																Not given												N	OO
1789	Undated	RD6	Warkworth																Not given												N	OO
1790	Undated	Matheson Bay	Auckland																Not given												N	OO
1791	Undated	Matheson Bay	Auckland																Not given												N	OO
1792	Undated	Matheson Bay	Auckland																Not given												N	OO
1793	Undated	Matheson Bay	Auckland																Not given												N	OO
1794	Undated		Matakana																Not given												N	OO
1795	Undated		Matakana																Not given												N	OO
1796	Undated	RD6	Warkworth																Not given												N	OO
1797	30.06.03		Leigh	Leigh Fishermen's Association															Not given												N	OO
1798	22.08.03		Tauranga				Y												O			1	1								N	OO
1799	30.06.03		Leigh	Leigh Fishermen's Association															Not given												Not given	OO
1800	Undated		Auckland	Marine Industry Association NZ (Chairman of Marine Reserves Committee)																											Y	QS
1801	23.06.03	TikiPunga	Whangarei				Y												O			1		1	1	1		1			N	OO

Do not support the size of this proposal - 10% of the size proposed would be ample. Marine reserves are needed - more so to keep out commercial fishing rather than recreational.				Yes
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
It would cancel any fishing in the area. The area does not get over fished & a reserve would not make any difference to the environment. I have never seen many other boats fishing in the area.		All		Yes
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: 'I/We oppose the marine reserve proposal on the north-east coast of Great Barrier Island'.				Form letter
Form submission: "I oppose the proposal for the above [Great Barrier Island] marine reserve. There should be no more marine reserves until such time as an overall strategic plan for whole of New Zealand is tabled to the public".				Form letter
This area is not needed for a reserve as it is not over fished. It is used by boaties & accessible.				Yes
Form submission: "I oppose the proposal for the above [Great Barrier Island] marine reserve. There should be no more marine reserves until such time as an overall strategic plan for whole of New Zealand is tabled to the public".				Form letter
The Marine Industry Association (MIA) represents 400 member companies including boat builders, charter boat operators, importers, retailers etc. The interests of boat users are paramount to our business livelihoods. In regards to this proposal we submit the following: "To protect the interests of local boaties wishing to fish on the north east side of GBI, it is recommended any reserve start at least 3 nautical miles seaward from low water mark from GBI & Arid Island. This will allow boaties to catch fish in the more sheltered parts of this proposed reserve".	All	Areas 2, 3, 4 & 5.		Letter
There is no scientific proof to validate reserve creation. There must be areas available in estuary for the collecting of shellfish for the general public. All areas of Barrier are important to me as they are areas where I can access my recreational bag limits of kaimoana,	All	All		Option 4

1802	1.09.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				O								1	N	OO
1803	13.08.03	Grey Lynn	Auckland				Y		Y	O		1		1	1			1	N	OO
1804	11.08.03		Thames	Pegasus Cruises (Master)			Y			O			1	1	1		1	1	N	OO
1805	11.08.03		Rotorua						Y	OC		1						1	N	OO
1806	5.08.03	Tryphena	Great Barrier Is			Y				OC								1	N	OO
1807	5.08.03	Maraetai	Auckland				Y			OC		1		1	1				N	OO
1808	5.08.03	Highland Park	Auckland					Y		OC		1			1				N	OO
1809	5.08.03	Maraetai	Auckland				Y			OC		1		1	1				N	OO
1810	4.08.03	Claris	Great Barrier Is		Y	Y				O		1	1	1	1				N	OO
1811	4.08.03	RD2	Kaitia	Rakitu Island Lessee family			Y		Y	O		1	1	1	1	1		1	N	OO
1812	1.08.03	Grey Lynn	Auckland				Y			OC		1		1	1			1	N	OO
1813	24.09.03	Te Atatu South	Auckland					Y		OC		1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1814	22.08.03	Kensington	Whangarei				Y			OC		1	1	1	1				N	OO
1815	22.08.03	RD3 Silverdale	Hibiscus Coast				Y			OC		1		1					N	OO
1816	22.08.03		Not given				Y			O		1	1		1				N	OO
1817	22.08.03	Takapuna	Auckland				Y			O		1	1		1				N	OO
1818	22.08.03	Whenuapai	Auckland				Y			O		1	1						N	OO
1819	22.08.03		Katikati				Y			O		1	1	1	1			1	N	OO
1820	22.08.03	Leigh Rd	Warkworth				Y			O		1	1	1	1				N	OO

I have lived in Awana for the past 43 years & use the estuary to regularly catch shellfish. I cannot agree with proposal in current form - it should be along the shores of DOC-controlled land. Proposal is too large. It cannot compromise the values of adjoining land owners. Locals want to be able to fish all around GBI & they are not the ones doing the damage. DOC & Ministry of Fisheries should work together & ban some types of commercial fishing in the Hauraki Gulf. A marine reserve in the Firth of Thames would be good as I understand fish spawn there.				Letter
Creating a marine reserve is not the way, what about quota management, by-catch being dumped & 90% of fish being exported? The total fish saved each year by a marine reserve will be dumped as by-catch in a month.				Option 4
The area is sustainable as it is. This will raise the pressure on other special areas & this is a deeply flawed principle. The administration costs of this will continually rise. I do not fish & was involved in protecting the groper in the Kermadec Islands. There is low pressure on area. It is wrong that DOC is promoting for internal reasons a new administration zone to please the privileged few. Reserves are only being proposed in areas the boaties enjoy. All areas should be protected by normal laws.	All	All		Option 4
Too large. Reduce total catch for all parties.				Option 4
Too many regulations, loss of freedom, too much loss of property rights.				Yes
Well known fishing spot for the whanau. I don't see myself benefiting.				Yes
Recreational fishing is not putting too much pressure on the area.	All	All		Yes
Our recreation rights as fishermen will be taken away from us.				Yes
Harotaonga coastal area would no longer be a recreational place for my family to frequent.				Yes
Who would police a reserve? Few boats go out this way because of the weather conditions. Keep commercial boats out. If DOC wants to protect the area it should not exclude recreational fishers as these people can help protect the area for DOC.	All			Yes & letter
I support the idea of marine reserves but not in the hurried underhand way they are being chosen & implemented. Comprehensive scientific research needs to be done on existing marine reserves to establish their benefit. A reserve would improve the view when diving but this is because there are more fish who have become conditioned to divers & not to hide. Where did the government's 10% figure come from? If DOC is serious about conservation it should move away from targeting recreational fishers & do something that will make a difference e.g. commercial fishers targeting broadbill swordfish.				Option 4
The land use needs to be looked at, not the sea. Look at land use & how it affects the breeding grounds of all marine life.		All		Option 4
We believe in peoples' right of free access to the area for diving & fishing for personal consumption. We see no benefits in this proposal, the isolation of the area protects it. Keep free access.				Yes
I disagree with proposal because: (1) Impact on locals - this proposal means that more than 10% of coast will be taken up by a marine reserve & this will have a large impact on residents. (2) Impact on visiting boats - reserve will deny the visiting boatie/fisher an area for cruising when the winds are from the south west. Many days this area is not able to be used because of weather. (3) Fish conservation - marine reserves are not the way to do it as they put pressure on other areas. It would be better to review daily catch limits.				Yes & letter
We are regular visitors to area & will not be able to stay there if it is a marine reserve. When moving around the back of GBI we will have to stay 12 miles out if we have fish on board which is very unsafe with my family on board.		All		Yes
There is no useful purpose to this proposal. We have fish quotas that protect the area. No benefit.		All		Yes
Area is self protecting due to weather conditions & can only be used a small portion of the year. I will not benefit in any way. There are already enough laws in place, they need to be policed.	All	All		Yes
Not necessary & too large. Unable & uneconomic to control. Infringement of personal rights. I cannot imagine any benefit.	All	All		Yes
Some of the marine reserve restrictions are totally unreasonable & the rules too hard to stick to. I don't think area needs any more protection than that it gets from its geographic isolation except for reviewing commercial pressure.				Yes

1821	22.08.03	Gulf Harbour	Whangaparaoa				Y			OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1822	22.08.03		Patumahoe			Y	Y			O			1		1					N	QS
1823	22.08.03		Thames				Y			O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1824	22.08.03	Takapuna	Auckland					Y		OC			1	1	1	1				Y	QS
1825	22.08.03	Torbay	Auckland					Y		OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1826	22.08.03	Manly	Whangaparaoa				Y			O			1	1	1	1				N	QO
1827	22.08.03		Warkworth					Y		OC			1			1				Y	QS
1828	22.08.03		Whangaparaoa				Y			O			1	1	1					N	OO
1829	22.08.03		Whangamata				Y			O			1	1		1				N	OO
1830	22.08.03		Warkworth				Y			O			1	1	1	1				Y	QO
1831	22.08.03		Mt Maunganui				Y			OC			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1832	22.08.03		Silverdale				Y			O			1	1	1					N	OO
1833	22.08.03	Clevedon	Auckland				Y			O			1	1	1				1	N	OO
1834	22.08.03		Papakura				Y			OC				1	1	1				Y	QS
1835	22.08.03	Torbay	Auckland					Y		OC			1	1						N	OO
1836	22.08.03	Pakuranga	Auckland	Tangata whenua			Y		Y	O			1	1	1	1				N	OO
1837	22.08.03		Tauranga				Y			O			1	1						N	OO
1838	22.08.03	Te Atatu Peninsula	Auckland				Y			OC			1		1	1				N	OO

If required the conservation principle can be applied without having to be designated as a reserve. No benefit to me or my family or future generations. All marine reserves should be banned from recreational areas because of officious approach by DOC staff when I surfaced with a crayfish bag adjacent to a marine reserve. As a responsible citizen, I am happy to respect fishing & diving regulations but I am angry at being prevented from doing these activities in a reserve.	All	All		Yes
This is a side that you can't always get to. Stop all commercial fishing in the area as that will help. You should have a marine reserve but not one this big.	All	Areas 2, 4, 5, 6 & 8.	Part of areas 3 & 7.	Yes
The restrictions it imposes are too great to be acceptable.		All		Yes
Support a smaller version e.g., around Arid Island. Exclude estuary as long as people are taking right amount of seafood. The size of the proposal is the main problem - how do you police such an area & how do you stop boats coming in with fish on board that is caught elsewhere & stop boats coming to shelter in area in bad weather? It makes it very dangerous.	All	Areas 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 & 8.	Area 5.	Yes
Totally unnecessary to have a reserve in such a strategic sailing, surfing & fishing area as this is. Human population is low on island so estuary is okay. Put reserves in populated areas so they would make a difference. Weather & isolation are currently enough to deter people from using proposal area.	All	All		Yes
We don't want that area denied to us for recreational fishing as we have fished there for 25 years. There is little doubt we would benefit from a reserve but there are better ways e.g. limiting commercial activity and/or moving commercial activity further from the coast. The area is not over fished by recreational fishers as the weather limits the time & occasions the area can be accessed.			Mokohinau Islands.	Yes
"Seeding" of adjacent areas with fish stocks from reserve. I consider the proposal extends too far offshore & is impractical if recreational fishers/boats are unable to pass through area with fish caught elsewhere.	None			Yes
Unnecessary. No benefit to myself or the public. DOC & staff should remember who pays their wages.	All	All		Yes
Isolation & ruggedness of area create a reserve on its own when it is inaccessible during rough weather. A reserve in this area would be impossible to police & protect from exploitation.	All	All		Yes
Support proposal south of Harotaonga. Everyone must benefit from reserves but not in the only anchorages on the north east coast. The area suggested should not be a reserve as it is the most hospitable for boats.		Areas 2, 3 & part of 4.	Southern part of 4 (south of Harotaonga).	Yes
Because it is a popular fishing & diving area.				Yes
It is the only safe & sheltered way around the back in regards to getting back to Fitzroy if whether changes for fishing & diving.				Yes
Simply not necessary as GBI is not easily accessible for small boats & therefore is not in danger of being over fished or abused. The danger to fisheries is from commercial fishing. What is the point of quota systems? DOC & Forest & Bird are land-based organisations with only text book knowledge of the sea & fish.	All	All		Yes
Benefits will be being able to look at any area how it was 100 years ago. I don't have a problem with smaller reserves but not the whole north east coast.		Areas 6, 7 & 8.	Areas 2, 3, 5 & part of 3.	Yes
Because there is nothing wrong with the way this area is currently used. No benefit at all from a marine reserve.		All		Yes
I feel there are enough reserves - 20% of the Barrier coast is too much. It will make no difference to the fish stocks & will only be used by a few scientists & divers but should be used by everyone. The area is already like a marine park & not abused by anyone, except commercial fishing.		All		Yes
There is already a large area taken out as a no-go zone by the Navy, which could be designated as a reserve & would affect nobody. No benefit to boating or other people. The area has the only fishing & safe anchorages on the outside of the Barrier. The government is proposing to allow iwi to fish in it for customary rights & this is not fair to other people. The government is buying Maori support by this proposal & this is racist in my opinion.	All	All		Yes
It takes away my rights to fish for good sized snapper when I get the chance. I would like to take my children there as well. There will be no benefits - why not just ban it during the winter period then we could use it in the summer. Stop commercial fishing around the island as they supply our fish to overseas countries. Have a good look at what is destroying our fisheries - you know it is not recreational. The area protects itself naturally.	All	All		Yes

1839	22.08.03	Glenfield	Auckland					Y												N	OO															
1840	22.08.03	Browns Bay	Auckland					Y												O		1		1										N	OO	
1841	22.08.03	Titirangi	Auckland					Y												O		1	1	1	1										N	OO
1842	22.08.03	Howick	Auckland					Y												OC		1													N	OO
1843	22.08.03		Not given					Y	Y											OC		1			1	1									Y	S
1844	22.08.03		Not given					Y												OC		1			1						1				N	OO
1845	22.08.03		Bombay	Clevedon Cruising Club (Treasurer)				Y												OC		1	1	1	1										N	OO
1846	22.08.03	Browns Bay	Auckland					Y												O		1		1											N	OO
1847	22.08.03		Whitianga	Marine Adventures (Owner)				Y												O	1	1	1	1	1	1	1								Not given	QO
1848	22.08.03	RD2	Whitianga					Y												OC		1		1	1										N	OO
1849	22.08.03	Albany	Auckland					Y												OC		1	1		1										N	OO
1850	22.08.03	RD5	Warkworth					Y												O		1	1	1	1										N	OO
1851	22.08.03	PDC Paerata	Pukekohe 1800					Y												OC		1	1		1										Y	QS
1852	22.08.03	Manurewa	Auckland	Clevedon Cruising Club (Committee)				Y												O		1	1	1	1										N	OO
1853	22.08.03	RD1	Waiheke Island					Y												O		1	1	1	1										N	OO

These are remote bays with good shelter from various winds & pleasant fishing spots which are not always accessible due to common easterly winds. By limiting places where you cannot fish, this will tend to overpopulate places where you can fish causing a bad chain reaction. The only benefit will be revenue collection. All of GBI & 5 miles surrounding it should be off limits to commercial fishing. DOC is unable to monitor & police the marine reserves already established. The other reserves serve the scientific purpose DOC requires.	All	All		Yes
The area is a natural reserve, protected by the exposure of the coast. No benefit at all.	All	All		Yes
The area is too user-friendly for all sorts of recreational use & water-based activities. I suggest another area e.g. south east corner would be more appropriate. I object to how DOC has gone about the process - feel it has been misrepresented & does not reflect the interests of New Zealanders. I do not see benefits relative to the loss of rights/use. DOC should extend existing marine reserves instead. DOC should try harder to get the support of locals & users by selecting areas that are not used so much. I agree that commercial fishing must be restricted to protect vulnerable marine areas but recreational use is positive in building awareness & appreciation.	All	Areas 2, 3, 4 & 5.		Yes
It is not heavily fished & doesn't require any further protection. I will not benefit. There is already a marine reserve in this area - a clearly marked no fishing area used by the Navy. Use this if you have to.	All	Areas 2, 3, 4 & 5.	Navy area.	Yes
Preservation of area that would otherwise be ruined by residents and/or commercial fishers.	None	Area 8.		Yes
Popular Christmas & holiday fishing & anchoring spot. No benefit. The topography of the area, e.g. exposed, means it does not get over fished except by large commercial fishers. There must be other, less popular areas of the coast for marine reserves.				Yes
Our rights to fish & dive has been open to us for years. This part of GBI is not over fished by recreational fishers. The fish stock issues should be addressed to commercial fishers who regularly rape the Gulf. I can see no benefit in this reserve. DOC & Ministry of Fisheries should put their resources into policing fishing by both commercial & recreational fishers in terms of enforcing catch limits & legal size. Legal size limits should be increased for snapper.		All		Yes
Fish stocks are good meaning the quota system is working. The weather conditions are such that it becomes a natural reserve because of the percentage of the time you cannot fish it. Build an artificial reserve off Long Bay instead as this would be good for the public & the area is a reserve already.	All	All		Yes
Already a reserve in place - the Navy no-take area. Access to food areas needs to be maintained.	All	Areas 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.	Areas 6 & 8.	Yes
It is ridiculous not to be able to anchor in such places. If you fish somewhere else, you will have to travel around such areas.		All		Yes
As yachters we need access to safe anchorages easily & often have "legal" fish on board. Can't think of any way we will benefit. We visit for 7-10 days each year.	All	All		Yes
Marine reserves do not work as shown by existing reserves. They create an imbalance. It is commercial net fishers that do the damage in depleting fish stocks, not recreational fishers. It is our right to fish. Take your reserves to a less accessible area. We will continue to use the area as we have as I don't think you will be able to police it anyway.	All	All		Yes
Having fished for 50 years on the coast & noted the fish numbers dwindling I think a small portion for a reserve would be advantageous. Prefer area from Waikaro Point to the Needles & one mile seaward. South of Waikaro Point should remain free for boating public to fish, dive, surf & enjoy the beaches. The weather in this area is the major factor in limiting the amount of time spent on the east coast.	All	Areas 2, 4 & 5.	Areas 3 & 7.	Yes
This area is used by us as a sheltered place when westerly weather prevents boating & fishing on the west side of Barrier. I feel the proposal is ridiculously large & that policing such large areas would be very expensive. The reserve will limit the locals & visitors in their recreational pursuits in this area. I find the attitude of DOC representatives arrogant.				Yes
A reserve would destroy all the pleasure of being able to catch such a diversity of different species of fish which we can only catch in this area which is so close to Auckland. All the anchorages & sheltered areas from prevailing winds should be excluded - if they are included in a reserve it will make them unusable by boaties who nearly all have fish on board.		Anchorage in areas 3, 4 & 5.		Yes

1854	22.08.03	Pakuranga	Auckland				Y				O			1	1		1				Y	QS
1855	22.08.03	Torbay	Auckland				Y				O			1	1	1					N	OO
1856	22.08.03	Howick	Auckland				Y				O			1	1		1				N	OO
1857	22.08.03	Bucklands Beach	Auckland				Y				O			1	1	1	1				N	QO
1858	22.08.03		Thames					Y		Y	OC			1	1	1					N	OO
1859	22.08.03	Glenfield	Auckland				Y				O			1		1					N	OO
1860	22.08.03	Glenfield	Auckland				Y				O			1		1					N	OO
1861	22.08.03	Muriwai Beach	Auckland				Y				O			1		1	1			1	N	OO
1862	22.08.03	Muriwai Beach	Auckland				Y				O			1		1	1			1	N	OO
1863	22.08.03	Muriwai Beach	Auckland				Y				O			1		1	1			1	N	OO

