Analysis of Boundary Design For Two Proposed Marine Reserves in the Eastern Bay of Islands: a report to Fish Forever

Vince Kerr, Kerr & Associates, April 2014

Client Brief

The community based Bay of Islands group Fish Forever has been investigating potential candidate areas with an aim to propose a system of marine reserves in the Eastern Bay of Islands. Two areas in the Eastern Bay of Islands have been identified to advance to a proposal stage. This report has been requested to evaluate the proposed boundaries against a set of criteria:

a) The ecological effectiveness of the boundaries in relation to the objectives of the proposed marine reserves;
b) The effectiveness of the boundaries in relation to ease of navigation and practicality of compliance and enforcement of the rules; and
c) The impact of the proposed marine reserves on recreational fishing hotspots and boundary areas

Introduction

The Fish Forever group has set as a design goal that in the Bay of Islands a target of 10% of representative habitats will be protected in long-term fully protected areas. They have based this goal on the general goals for marine protection stated in the NZ Biodiversity Strategy (NZ Govt., 2000) and the Government's Marine Protected Area Strategy (DOC & MinFish., 2008). Fish Forever have also reviewed international literature including the United Nations' recommendations on marine reserve network design which have served to focus their design on the 10% minimum goal as the start point for their work. In addition they have used a more detailed set of design criteria set out in a guideline paper by the author (Kerr, 2010).

The criteria that Fish Forever used are outlined below.

Ecological Principles

1. **Representation**

To maintain natural examples of the full range of New Zealand marine biota,

each region with major differences in marine life must be represented and within each region all obviously-different habitats must be represented.

2. Replication

To allow scientifically-valid measurements, to provide for social needs, and to prevent single accidents destroying sole examples, replicas of each habitat in each region must be included in the reserve system.

3. Network Design

Since most marine life has free-floating larvae (or other small reproductive and dispersal products) that drift a long way from their parents, single reserves are unlikely to be self-sustaining and the design of the system must be a network. The spacing of the reserves is as important as their size. As more reserves are created positive interactions and system benefits increase exponentially. Ideally reserves should be evenly spread through a region or planning area.

4. Sustainability – Viability

The total area of the high level protection reserve system must be sufficient to sustain its natural character. Reserves should be permanent or generationally reviewed to allow for ecological processes and benefits to be fully realized. Current scientific opinion internationally states that high level protected area networks produce maximum benefits to biodiversity, habitats and fisheries' productivity where the extent of highly protected areas reaches 20-50 % of the total area (Bohnzack, 2000). Fish Forever has suggested that a practical initial design goal of 10% of protected areas would provide a basis for evaluating the network, provide a wide range of benefits, especially locally, and is consistent with developing New Zealand policy (Ballantine, 1999)

Ecological Criteria

a) Size of reserves: big is better and will achieve more in terms of species and habitats that are effectively protected or restored. Usually reserve boundaries become popular and productive fishing locations. This leads to a negative 'edge effect'. Small reserves are affected to a larger degree. Where possible reserves should be a minimum of 6km of coastline and extend out to sea as far as possible. In some cases there may be a strong design case for much smaller reserves. Their effectiveness is less understood but indications are that they are still valuable for some species and habitats.

b) The above principles apply at all scales. Where possible reserves for a given planning area should attempt to include and replicate all habitats of a given area. Reserves that maximize the diversity of habitats represented are preferred.

c) There is a strong argument to avoid boundaries which cut through habitats like reefs if it can be avoided.

d) Include areas of soft sediments surrounding reef areas if at all possible – there are very important ecological connections between reefs and the adjacent soft sediment areas. Ideally theses soft sediment areas should extend 2km from the reef.

e) Rocky reefs beyond approximately 30m depth are a mostly different community than shallow reefs. The 'deep reef' is dominated by encrusting invertebrates instead of algal species which form the community structure of shallow reefs. Where possible a reserve should include a continuous sequence of these habitats within the reserve.

f) Islands including little rocks on top of reefs are hot spots for reef communities and pelagic species for a host of reasons. They provide a lot of habitat diversity with highly varied exposures, currents and often physical complexity. Include them completely with surrounding reef if at all possible - avoid running boundary lines to them or thinking of them as good markers (they may be of course but also they are biodiversity hot spots).

g) Reserves where possible should avoid disturbance to existing uses of the coastline, examples are favorite fishing spots and important customary harvesting sites. Note that there has to be limits to this consideration due to the fact that in many areas the entire coast is heavily fished, thus the urgent need for reserves.

h) Reserves may create 'new favorite fishing places' around their boundaries - this aspect can be noted and enhanced with careful site selection. There are three distinct possibilities that can become a design focus. Where boundary lines cross a significant habitat, it is much more likely the spill-over of exploited species and therefore fishing opportunity will be enhanced (Freeman et al., 2009). The other possibility involves placing a boundary near some special feature located adjacent but outside of the reserve that once was a significant fishing spot, but is now only lightly fished or not fished at all due to overfishing. In this scenario the adjacent site becomes a new hotspot due to the proximity of the reserve. The third scenario is where a boundary is located near an existing popular fishing spot. In this case the existing 'hotspot' is potentially further enhanced by the reserve due to the spillover effect. The potential for spill-over to adjacent fishing spots is not just about more fish being available. Reserves can create new opportunities to catch large or record size fish. (Callum et al., 2001).A recent major study in South Africa showed that reserves can have a significant positive effect of stabilising or even increasing commercial catch rates in a local fishery for an exploited specie despite the loss of 'fishing area' taken up by the reserves (Kerwath et al., 2013).

i) For some reserves secondary benefits become important design considerations such as the need for public access, local economic development etc. These considerations can be included in the design process on a case by case basis as they are very real to communities.

j) Under the Precautionary Principle, design should be carried out using best possible evidence currently available. Where uncertainty exists design decisions should err on the side of protecting biodiversity and habitats.

Practical Boundary Design Criteria

a) For shore boundaries look for a place where any or all of the listed features enhance effectiveness of a boundary maker:
    1. Prominent shoreline features such as a protruding point, large rock, change in geological formation, middle of a small beach etc.;
    2. Well known landmark;
    3. A position on the shoreline that can be lined up with a second marker placed on a hill or skyline feature lying in a line behind the shore marker. This can be used for an effective 'line of sight' visible for up to several kilometres offshore.
b) If practical use east-west or north-south lines which assist navigation.
c) Avoid complex boundaries that do not have good natural markers
d) If practical for lines off shore use a line that is close to a bathymetry contour line. This is a helpful locator/ navigation aid for fishermen.
e) Reliance on expensive buoy markers especially in waters over 20m depth is to be avoided if possible.
f) For seaward boundaries that have good line of sight references to land straight lines can be effective.
g) In some cases where a shoreline is highly irregular a seaward boundary may best be defined by a distance offshore description. This method has both advantages and disadvantages.

Note: The above criteria were applied within the context of the general criteria laid out in the Marine Reserves Act 1971.

Methods and Summary of Design Process Used

From 2011 until present the Fish Forever group has been carrying out a 'mark the chart' project based on their website. (http://www.fishforever.org.nz/how-you-can-help-ff/have-your-say-mark-the-chart/16-have-your-say.html). To date 430 people have responded to this survey. Fish Forever have also carried out extensive discussions with a wide range of Bay of Islands groups and individuals documented in their discussion document (2014). From all of this work the two areas currently proposed stood out as having the most potential as candidate marine reserve areas. This first level design process was largely based on ecological values present and popularity with the community. Initially there were many versions of boundaries put forward for evaluation.

To assist further refinement of the candidate area boundaries, a GIS project was set up based on the Northland Marine Habitat Map (2010) and supported by recent field survey work done by the author (in progress) and J. Gibb (2012). The field survey projects looked at refinement

and description of habitats and geological values in the Waewaetorea and Maunganui proposal areas. Recently available high resolution aerial photography was sourced from the Ocean 20:20 Bay of Islands Coastal Survey Project which supported detailed study of key sites in the process.

Many alternatives of possible lines were drawn and tested against the ecological and practical criteria until the current configuration of the boundaries was arrived at.

Assessment included analysis of the amount of habitat represented in the proposal area compared to the amount of these habitats ocurring in the Bay of Islands as a whole. The boundaries were also checked for the degree in which they included whole areas of important habitats such as reefs and wherever possible buffer areas of soft sediment bottom areas surrounding important reef structures.

Following the ecological assessment described above the boundaries were tested for their practical effectiveness which involved drawing possible lines of sight and assessing whether marker buoys could be practical as well as drawing lines of sight to potential shore markers and or prominent geological features. The shore marker site selection process and line of sight design was then checked and refined on the water with GPS chart sounder equipment similar to those most fishing boats would have. Pictures of the lines of sight markers and shore markers were taken from various points where navigation would be important such as seaward corners. There were numerous adjustments made to the boundaries during these stages of the process.

Results of Boundary Analysis

Table 1 below shows that the two proposed areas account for 6.3% of the total area of the Bay of Islands and the Rahui area at Maunganui Bay accounts for 0.5% of the Bay of Islands.

Area	Percentage of BOI design area
Maunganui Proposal	3.0%
Waewaetorea Proposal	3.3%
Rahui Area	0.5%

Table 1 Percentage of Bay of Islands within proposed reserves.

In order to determine to what extent the proposed marine reserves include representative habitats, a calculation was made of the total habitat areas for the Bay of Islands and is included below in Table 2 below.

		BOI Design Area	% of area
Depth	**Habitat**	**Hectares**	
intertidal	sand	68.5	0.23
intertidal	salt marsh	3.5	0.01
intertidal	rock	558.9	1.85
intertidal	mud	2,635.3	8.71
intertidal	mangroves	1,273.9	4.21
intertidal	gravel	26.6	0.09
shallow	seagrass	28.5	0.09
shallow	rodolith bed	51.2	0.17
shallow	reef	2,589.6	8.56
shallow	fine sediments	6,456.0	21.34
shallow	coarse sediments	4,776.5	15.79
shallow	channel	511.8	1.69
deep	reef	2,699.9	8.92
deep	fine sediments	6,207.6	20.5
deep	coarse sediments	1,587	5
	Island	778.2	2.6
Totals		**30,252**	**100.0**

Table 2. Calculation of habitat areas in Bay of Islands based on the (2010) Northland Marine Habitats Map.

Table 3 below shows the calculations of the percentage of representation of habitats within each proposal area and then shows what percentage of the total Bay of Islands habitat areas which occur in the proposal areas.

Generally speaking the two proposed marine reserves are effective in achieving representation of habitats commonly found in the outer coastal parts of the Bay of Islands. For instance both reserves include proportionately good percentages of intertidal habitats, typical coastal shores such as rock platforms and gravel and sand beaches. They do not represent well habitats that are typical of estuaries and more sheltered and inland parts of the Bay of Islands such as mangroves, mud flats and salt marsh. For the shallow and deep subtidal habitats the same thing applies: these proposal areas have good representation of reefs and fine and coarse sediment areas. It is significant that each of the proposal areas has a balance of shallow and deep reef areas and surrounding soft sediments which is the ideal arrangement to maximise the number of species which benefit from the reserves. The

arrangement of boundary lines in relation to these key habitats will discussed further for each reserve.

Size of Reserves

Both proposal areas are around 1,000ha and have shoreline lengths of 7.34 km for the Maunganui proposal and 17.02 km for the Waewaetorea proposal area calculated in the GIS project from a 1:5,000 scale base map. While there is little agreement on how small reserves can be and still be effective these two reserves are both larger than the Leigh Reserve which is 518ha in area. They are however not as big as the Poor Knights Marine Reserve which is 2,400 ha or the Te Tapuwae O Rongokako Marine Reserve in Gisborne which is 2,450 hectares. These proposals are dwarfed in size compared to the largest marine reserve in New Zealand waters. The Kermedec Islands Marine Reserve which is 748,245 ha in area. Both of the reserves have a number of special features and excellent habitat diversity and representation. Their size should not be a limiting factor. There are however some expected exceptions to this generalisation. Some marine species that have much larger home ranges or are primarily pelagic or migratory in their behaviours will benefit to a much more limited degree from reserves of this size. Taking dolphins as one example, over time they may frequent the reserves a disproportionate amount of time due to the increased activity and biomass of prey in the reserves, thus benefiting from the reserve, however they would not be expected to become full-time residents there. One important point about these larger more mobile predator species, is that we don't really know to what degree their behaviors will be affected by the reserves. It could be argued that anything that attracts these species back to the Bay helps to secure and restore their food sources and keeps them there longer is a good thing.

Network Benefits

Part of the design goal of these two proposals is that they form in combination an effective addition to the overall network of protected areas in the Bay of Islands as well as contributing to the larger Northland and Northeast Bioregion network of protected areas. In this case both reserves are between 3 and 4 kms from the settlement of Rawhiti which means the habitats immediately around Rawhiti stand to benefit most from any spill-over benefits. It is important to note that at any time marine life could move from either reserve towards the areas around Rawhiti, thus there is something like double the chance of a positive impact in these areas. There is a very good chance that marine life moving between the reserves could to some degree assist the restoration of marine life and habitats in each reserve. i.e. being only 4kms apart from each other there could well be positive ecological connections.

Chris Gibbins 23/4/14 8:42 PM
Comment: Isn't Northland the region?

The other nearest marine reserve is 53 kms away at the Poor Knight's Marine reserve. It is not known if there could be positive ecological connections between reserves at this size separated at this distance but it is a possibility as both these areas are bathed by the same current, the East Auckland Current and both areas experience settlement of larvae of

subtropical species from that current. In some cases these sub-tropical species could move across this sort of distance. As more marine reserves are added to the network at appropriate distances the chance for positive connection increases exponentially. It is suggested that due to the quality environment and habitats of the two proposed reserve areas they will definitely contribute significantly to any future network of marine reserves established in this region.

		Maunganui Proposal	% of proposal area	% of BOI Habitats	Waewaetorea Proposal	% of Proposal Area	% of BOI Habitats
Depth	**Habitat**	**Hectares**			**Hectares**		
intertidal	sand	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.6	8.8
intertidal	salt marsh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
intertidal	rock	11.4	1.3	2.0	36.3	3.6	6.5
intertidal	mud	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
intertidal	mangroves	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
intertidal	gravel	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.1	5.4
shallow	seagrass	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.1	4.9
shallow	rodolith bed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
shallow	reef	47.4	5.2	1.8	193.5	19.3	7.5
shallow	fine sediments	1.5	0.2	0.0	91.3	9.1	1.4
shallow	coarse sediments	36.8	4.1	0.8	309.2	30.8	6.5
shallow	channel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
deep	reef	102.7	11.3	3.8	102.2	10.2	3.8
deep	fine sediments	443.3	48.8	7.1	23.7	2.4	0.4
deep	coarse sediments	264.8	29.2	16.7	238.4	23.8	15.0
Totals		908	100		1,003	100	

Table 3 Calculated areas and percentages of habitats included in the proposed marine reserves and percentages of total Bay of Islands habitats included in the proposed reserves.

		Maunganui Bay Rahui Area	% of Proposal Area	% of BOI Habitats
Depth	Habitat	Hectares		
intertidal	sand	0.0	0.0	0.0
intertidal	salt marsh	0.0	0.0	0.0
intertidal	rock	11.2	7.1	2.0
intertidal	mud	0.0	0.0	0.0
intertidal	mangroves	0.0	0.0	0.0
intertidal	gravel	0.0	0.0	0.0
shallow	seagrass	0.0	0.0	0.0
shallow	rodolith bed	0.0	0.0	0.0
shallow	reef	35.6	22.6	1.4
shallow	fine sediments	22.2	14.1	0.3
shallow	coarse sediments	33.3	21.1	0.7
shallow	channel	0.0	0.0	0.0
deep	reef	7.3	4.6	0.3
deep	fine sediments	37.9	24.1	0.6
deep	coarse sediments	9.9	6.3	0.6
Totals		157.4	100.0	

Table 4 Calculated areas and percentages of habitats included in the Maunganui Bay Rahui Area and percentages of total Bay of Islands habitats included in the proposed marine reserves.

Ecological Criteria - Maunganui Marine Reserve Proposal

Map 1 below shows the proposed boundaries drawn over the top of the Northland Marine Habitats Map (2010). As discussed previously Table 3 sets out the areas of the various habitats included in the reserve. This proposal area has outstanding examples of exposed rocky shore and shallow and deep reefs. Care was taken to provide for soft sediment buffer areas around the major reef systems in the proposal area. For all the reef areas except the associated reefs of Bird Rock to the North there is at least 400m of soft sediment area between the boundary and the edge of the reefs. In general terms this is not an ideal buffer distance (2km would be better, but it is far better than having no buffer area around the reefs. For a reserve of this size this could be considered a fair trade-off. For the reef on the Northern

boundary, this was more a practical decision of needing to achieve a good line of sight boundary line (discussed in next section) and the need to keep the boundary a practical distance from Bird Rock which was omitted from inclusion on the grounds that it is such a popular fishing and diving location. Since the majority of this reef is outside the boundary it is suggested there will be little overall negative impact from having the line positioned here over the reef. Put another way the alternative solution from an ecological view would be to contain all of the Bird Rock reef system and a soft sediment buffer area surrounding it in the reserve. This was considered impractical as it would impact too much on recreational fishing and spear-fishing.

Lines that touch the shorelines are positioned in a way they will have the least negative impact. They extend straight out from the shoreline where the extent of the fringing reef is relatively constrained.



Map 1. Proposal at Maunganui Bay and Rahui area. Base layer is the Northland Habitat Map (2010).

Practical Boundary Design Criteria - Maunganui Marine Reserve Proposal

Various options for boundaries were examined for this proposal area. Once the basic ecological objectives and possibilities were worked through attention was focused on how to create the most cost-efficient and practical boundaries from a user navigation point of view

and a management and compliance perspective. The proposed lines of sight and shore marker location have all been checked from the relevant seaward positions and all were deemed to be the best and most practical options for these locations.

A distance off shore boundary, such as that used at the Poor Knights Marine Reserve was considered and ruled out as not as easy to navigate as a system with good lines of sight and effective shore markers.

Referring to Map 2 & 3 below it is proposed that Line D utilises shore markers at point 5 with one placed above the splash zone and one further up the hill which form a sighting line out to sea enabling skippers to 'line up' the two markers. This line also has a seaward line of sight marker of Bird Rock which is easy to see from the distances involved. In the information gazetted for the marine reserve there could also be a bearing listed for Line D that could also be used for navigation.

Line C is a line formed by a line of sight between Otuwhanga Island (The Goat) and Mt Pocock, a prominent high hill top on the western side of the Bay of Islands. There could be bearings also listed for sightings in either direction to each of the landmarks.

Line B is formed with a North/South bearing and sighting line from the prominent peak Pukehuia behind Oke Bay to the South. While the landmark Pukehuia is some considerable distance away it is a relatively easy landmark to spot and effective at the distances involved here.

Line A is an east/west bearing sighting line running out from two shore markers. This line can also be lined up with Te Hoanga Point at Urupukapuka Island. The two shore markers are proposed to be located just above the splash line and further up the hill so that they will be effective for 'lining up' the line for a distance of up to 2km offshore.

The lines forming the boundary with the Rahui at present are proposed to have no shore markers or buoys marking them. If the Rahui continues with a no fishing designation this boundary is not seen as presenting any practical problems in terms of requiring further markers. If the Rahui is wound up then either the previous Rahui area could be added to the proposed marine reserve or additional markers could be established as needed.



Map 2. Proposal area at Maunganui Bay and coast showing boundary points and lines, including the boundary of the current Rahui area.



Map 3. Map of Maunganui Bay and coast showing the lines of sight which form the boundary lines of the proposal area.

Ecological Criteria - Waewaetorea Proposal

The habitat diversity of the area around the four islands, Motukiekie, Okahu, Waewaetorea and Urupukapuka is by any measure very high and complex. This has much to do with the nature and location of these islands and their effect on currents and wave exposure. It is well known that islands produce the highest levels of habitat diversity and as a result biological diversity. In this case there is an added complexity of there being three distinct channels within the proposal area, Waewaetorea, Okahu, and the Motukiekie-Waewaetorea Islands channel. Channels such as these add unique dimensions to these areas with their currents sweeping through complex habitats, such as patch reefs or biogenetic habitats like the algal turf beds that are common there. As a result they can become biodiversity hotspots.

Map 4 below illustrates how the boundaries have been placed in relation to the main physical habitats as mapped in the Northland Marine Habitat Map 2010. This habitat forms a basis for designing around the most significant habitat boundaries such as shallow and deep reefs and major soft bottom areas. However in an area like this the 2010 map represents a highly simplified picture of the actual habitat complexity and as noted in the (2010) report the quality of aerial photos available at the time the map was drawn was limiting. A more recent survey of the area resulting in a finer scale habitat map with more habitat divisions is

currently being written up by the author. This new habitat map has habitat areas defined for algal turf, finer scale boundaries between gravels, fine sands, cobble areas and kina barren, shallow mixed weed, *Eklonia radiata* kelp forest and deep sponge dominated reefs. This more detailed information was available to the design process of the Fish Forever group in draft form.

The Waewaetorea proposal area incorporates an impressive list of shallow and intertidal habitats:

- Rocky shore platforms of virtually all degrees of exposure and the intermediate transition areas, i.e. very exposed to sheltered.
- Special features of the rocky shoreline including large 'guts', a selection of small islets and exposed rocks of various exposures.
- A significant seagrass bed at Entico Bay and additional patches in other sheltered areas.
- A small estuary and example of mangroves not commonly found associated with islands.
- Sheltered sandy beaches.
- Significant areas of a biogenic algal turf habit on the sheltered side of Waewaetorea and Urupukapuka Islands and in the Channel between these islands and the Motukiekie Islands.
- The semi-sheltered and sheltered gravel and sand beaches of the four islands in the proposal area represent some of the best examples of these beaches in the Bay of Islands and are even more significant because they adjoin the complex channel areas between these islands.
- The area of shallow rocky reef in the proposal area is significant in the context of the overall Bay of Islands (being 19.28% of the proposal area and 7.47 % of the Bay of Islands shallow rocky reef habitats). What's more these shallow reefs are very diverse including a full range of exposures, some very complex structural topology, pinnacles and guts and diverse tidal and oceanic currents.
- The shallow reef kelp forests range in composition from those typical of very exposed sites to those of more sheltered situations. On the sheltered sides of island kina barrens are common and in places extensive. On the more exposed sides of the islands the *Eklonia radiata* kelp forests are mainly quite healthy with small isolated kina barrens.

Just over one third of the proposal area lies in depths greater than 30m which are described as 'deep' habitats in the (2010) habitat map. The 102ha of deep reef habitats in the proposal area form 3.79% of the Bay of Islands deep reef habitats area. In the recent habitat survey conducted by the author video ground truthing was carried out in a number of locations on these reefs. Over all the quality of this sponge and filter feeding community could be described as high quality. Generally speaking the depth zone of 30-60m is one of the most productive zones of this type of deep reef where there are complex reef structures and significant currents of oceanic water masses. All these conditions are met for these reefs.

Location of boundary lines for this proposed marine reserve presents some considerable challenges. Generally speaking the proposed boundary lines work very well for shallow reefs with two exceptions. The exceptions are Line B extending out from the northwest tip of Motukiekie Island and Line E extending northeast out from Te Hoanga Point on Urupukapuka Island. In both cases lines cut through the shallow reef. While this is not ideal from the conservation perspective it was necessary for practical reasons (discussed below) to do this. From a recreational fishing perspective these two boundary lines may produce enhanced fishing in the areas adjacent to these two boundaries due to fish and crayfish freely moving across these reef structures (Freeman et al., 2009). Both of these areas are currently popular fishing areas. The extensive shallow reefs around Okahu and Waewaetorea Islands have good soft bottom buffer areas around them. To the seaward side of the proposal these shallow reefs have continuous connection with areas of deep reef which adds more opportunity for ecological connections to occur and species to move from habitat to habitat within the reserve area.

The effectiveness of the boundary lines across deep reefs is quite compromised in this proposal due to the practical constraints of size and large areas these deep reefs cover in this part of the Bay of Islands. The plus here is that there are some significant areas of deep reef within the boundary and some of these reefs have good soft bottom habitat areas associated with them.



Map 4. Proposal at Waewaetorea, Okahu, Urupukapuka and Motukiekie Islands. Base layer is the Northland Habitat Map (2010).

As described above for the Maunganui Proposal boundary design process, the basic ecological objectives and possibilities were the initial focus. The next step was to create the most cost-efficient and practical boundaries from a user navigation point of view and a management and compliance perspective. The proposed lines of sight and shore marker locations for this proposal as illustrated in Maps 5 & 6 below have all been checked from the seaward positions that are relevant and all were deemed to be best and most practical options for these locations.

A distance off shore boundary, such as that used at the Poor Knights Marine Reserve was considered and ruled out as not as easy to navigate as a system with good lines of sight and effective shore markers.

Line A runs between shore marker on the shore of Urupukapuka Island in Paradise Bay to the Southeastern most tip of Motukiekie Island. These will be highly effective shore markers and navigation of this line should pose no problems.

Line B runs Northwest out from Pt 3 to Pt 4 off the Northwest point of Motukiekie Island. The line is a line of sight with the Ninepin Island which is readily seen from this distance. There will be a bearings listed for this line sighting to either end. The location of the shore marker at Pt 3 also has a suitable site for a second shore marker to be placed up the hill that could be used to 'line –up' the two markers forming an accurate line of sight for up to 2km off shore. One reason this line was placed here was to avoid the various reefs associated with the channel between Motukiekie and Moturua Islands which is a well known valuable fishing spot.

Line C is a line of sight and a bearing line to Rangitea Island from Pts 4 & 5. This line will have a back bearing to Rangitea Island. The final location of this line was given a great deal of thought and there were many iterations explored. Essentially a balance was sought between wanting to include as much of the reef system as possible against also wanting to exclude nearby Whale Rock and the reefs immediately around it on the grounds that it is a significant fishing area and spearfishing site.

Line D is a line of sight line to Mt Pocock from Pts 4 & 5. Mount Pocock's outline is quite pronounced on the Northwest shore of the Bay of Islands from these distances. There will be a bearing to Mount Pocock from Pts 4 & 5 listed. This line has another feature that will aid navigation, the line was designed to follow the 50m depth contour line for its entire length. This will allow any vessel with a depth sounder to know simply by depth if they are in or out of the reserve areas when in the vicinity of the boundary.

Line E is formed as a line of sight extending out for a shore marker at Pt 7. This location has an ideal site for a second shore marker to be placed up on the hill allowing for an accurate

line of site ‘lining up’ the two shore markers. There will be a back bearing listed from Pt 6 back to Pt 7 as well.



Map 5. Proposal area at Waewaetorea, Okahu, Urupukapuka and Motukiekie Islands showing boundary points and lines.



Map 6. Proposal at Waewaetorea, Okahu, Urupukapuka and Motukiekie Islands showing the lines of sight which form the boundary lines of the proposal area.

Summary

The process that the Fish Forever group used to design the current marine reserve proposal was systematic and made good use of best possible information available to them. They have also demonstrated the utility and practice of setting specific design goals for their process which is modelled and recommended as best practice internationally but not as yet practiced in a clear and transparent manner elsewhere in this country. They have used a comprehensive blend of practical and design criteria and introduced a 'network design concept' as well which has also not been widely observed to date in New Zealand but is now widely accepted in international literature.

After working through all the discussions and preliminary designs it is the author's opinion that Fish Forever has arrived at some very useful proposals and that in both ecological terms and practical terms these are good boundary proposals, worthy of further consideration by the public and the government for implementation.

Limitations of this Report and Analysis

Ultimately the decision of best boundaries and the creation of a marine reserve lies in the hands of the process prescribed in the Marine Reserves Act and finally at the hands of the Ministers involved. This report describes the process followed by Fish Forever, however it is not the only way marine reserves could be designed and along the way there are numerous possible answers to many of the design questions and therefore there is potential for other good alternative designs.

In various sections of this report there are considerations described around recreational fishing areas being impacted by the reserve and concessions made in locating boundaries to avoid some of the more significant recreational fishing areas. In addition the process also looked at the possibility that some adjoining fishing locations could have enhanced future fishing opportunities. There is however a larger consideration of impacts of the proposed reserves on recreational fishing more generally. Fish Forever is still studying this issue and gathering more information and is fully aware of its importance to the community.

The process reviewed in this report also does not attempt to review impacts of the proposals on customary fishing in the areas concerned. At the time of writing this report the Hapu of the Rawhiti area have requested more time to consider their position.

Design process should always be informed by best possible information and should not wait for some future breakthrough in information. At the same time it is important to recognise the limitations of the information being used. For this process Fish Forever was fortunate to have considerable local knowledge and experience 'on the water' within its group and the wider community. In addition it was helpful to have a comprehensive marine habitat map, high quality aerial photography and to undertake additional survey work on its own behalf. However it should be noted that even with all these advantages there remains a lot of unknown detail about these areas in terms of habitat complexity, actual biodiversity and ecosystem health. There have been many observations made of specific species abundance and local ecology but there has been very little quantitative survey work done in these areas at the species level. The sea is very complex and no site is ever likely to have everything known and mapped to the extent we might like. This is the case with these proposal areas. The habitat map used for example is a Northland scale map drawn at 1:5,000 scale which uses a simplified physical habitat based system of classification. In this process the habitat map serves as a proxy for ecosystems and species. It must be understood that there are limitations to using broad scale habitat information in this way.

Fish Forever wish to be transparent about how they arrived at their proposal and would like to emphasise that their proposal is just that – a proposal. It is the beginning of a comprehensive process, including full public consultation, which will no doubt significantly inform the selection of boundaries of any marine reserves created in the Bay of Islands.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to acknowledge the Fish Forever group for doing much of the work behind this process and their support for this review. The author thanks Arla Kerr for her contribution as proof editor. Dean Wright from Fish Forever is a Bay of Islands skipper and watched over, tested and checked the navigation information. Dr Roger Grace provided valuable review notes for this report and to the design process which were much appreciated.

References

Ballantine W.J., 1999, Marine reserves in New Zealand: the development of the concept and the principles. Published as pages 3-38 in the Proceedings of an International Workshop on Marine Conservation for the New Millennium, Korean Ocean Research and Development Institute, Cheju Is.. (available at http//:www.marine-reserves.org.nz)

Bernstein, B., Iudicello, S., Stringer, C., 2004. Lessons Learned from Recent Marine Protected Area Designations in the United States A Report to: The National Marine Protected Areas Center NOAA. The National Fisheries Conservation Center, Ojai, California.

Bohnsack, J.A., et. al. 2000. A Rationale for Minimum 20-30% No-take Protection. 9th International Coral Reef Symposium.

Department of Conservation et al., 2000. New Zealand biodiversity strategy. NZ Govt Press., 2000

Department of Conservation & Ministry of Fisheries. Marine Protected Areas: Classification, Protection Standard and Implementation Guidelines. (2008).

Fish Forever, 2014. Proposal to protect 10% of the enclosed waters of the Bay of Islands with no-take marine reserves. Community consultation document, released May 1st, 2014. Prepared for Fish Forever a sub group of the Bay of Islands Maritime Park Inc.

Freeman, D., J., MacDiarmid, A., B., Taylor, R., B., 2009. Habitat patches that cross marine reserve boundaries: consequences for the lobster. Jasus edwardsii. Marine Ecology Progress Series, Vol. 388: 159–167, 2009.

Gibb, J., 2012. Application of geology and physical oceanography to establish a marine reserve in an outstanding site, Eastern Bay of Islands, Northland, New Zealand. Report prepared for Bay of Islands Maritime Park Incorporated. Coastal Management Consultancy Limited. 200 Rangitane Road, RD1, Kerikeri 0294, New Zealand. Email: jgiggcmc@ihug.co.nz.

Kerr, V.C., 2010. Marine Habitat Map of Northland: Mangawhai to Ahipara Vers. 1. Technical Report, Department of Conservation, Northland Conservancy, Whangarei, New Zealand.

[NOTE: These two references should be a and b and the relevant ones noted as such in the text.]

Kerr, V.C., 2010. Marine Protected Areas Network Design – Practical Working Guidelines from International Best Practice. Self-published. http://www.marinenz.org.nz/index.php/resources/doc_category/network_design_guidelines/

Kerwath, S., E., Winker, H., Go, A., Attwood, C.G., 2013. Marine protected area improves yield without disadvantaging fishers. Nature Communications http//:www.nature.com/naturecommunications

New Zealand Government. New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy. (2000). At http://www.biodiversity.govt.nz/pdfs/picture/nzbs-whole.pdf

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2004). Technical Advice On The Establishment and Management of a National System of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas, SCBD, 40 pages (CBD Technical Series no. 13). http://www.marinenz.org.nz/documents/cbd_tech_bulletin_no_13_2004.pdf

Department of Conservation et al., 2000. New Zealand biodiversity strategy. NZ Govt Press., 2000.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, (2004). Technical Advice On The Establishment and Management of a National System of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas, SCBD, 40 pages (CBD Technical Series no. 13). http://www.marinenz.org.nz/documents/cbd_tech_bulletin_no_13_2004.pdf

Thomas, H., L., & Shears, N., 2013. Marine Protected Area Networks: Process design and ecosystem-based approaches. The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand.

[NOTE: References need a tidy up.]