
From: howard west <pmihawaii2@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 3:36 PM
To: Mailroom Mailbox
Cc: Angela Christensen
Subject: Fw: Submission on the Indigenous Freshwater Fish Amendment Bill

Reference Policy 4.102. Please see the below submission at the end of this email.

Thank you,

Howard West

From: Angela Christensen <achristensen@fishandgame.org.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 3:54 PM
To: pmihawaii2@hotmail.com <pmihawaii2@hotmail.com>
Subject: FW: Submission on the Indigenous Freshwater Fish Amendment Bill

Hi Howard

Thank you for your email with the subject identified as "Submission on Indigenous Freshwater Fish Amendment Bill". I believe that submissions to Central Government on this bill closed in October 2018. The bill has been referred to the Environment Committee and is currently going through its Second Reading.

The other topic that is currently open for submissions is Proposed Plan Change 7 (PC7) to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan which you may have received an email from Fish & Game about. A policy within PC7 proposes to allow for the passage of indigenous species while prohibiting the passage of all other species (which would include sports fish). I believe that the email you sent below is highly relevant to this particular point as well and would be worth lodging with the Regional Council.

I would encourage you to reference Policy 4.102 in your submission (below is the proposed wording of the policy for your information) and to send your email to the Canterbury Regional Council at mailroom@ecan.govt.nz. Reference that it is a submission for Plan Change 7.

Proposed Policy 4.102 states:

Structures enable the safe passage of indigenous fish, while avoiding as far as practicable, the passage of any invasive, pest or nuisance fish species by:

- a. *The appropriate design, construction, installation and maintenance of new in-stream structures; and*
- b. *The modification, reconstruction or removal of existing in-stream structures.*

Please feel free to contact me with any questions. Thank you for your support.

Kind regards

Angela Christensen | Resource Officer
Central South Island Fish & Game Council

PO Box 150, Temuka, New Zealand

P +64 3 615 8400 | M +64 021 843 968 | E achristensen@csifgc.org.nz | W www.fishandgame.org.nz



From: howard west <pmihawaii2@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 9 September 2019 4:50 PM
To: Rhys Adams <radams@fishandgame.org.nz>
Subject: Submission on the Indigenous Freshwater Fish Amendment Bill

I am against the above Bill and believe as written it puts more at risk than it offers in potential reward. What is at a risk is a large, high profit "golden goose" trout fishery which is the envy of the world and is an important component of NZ's international reputation, which is already being threatened by water quality issues.

After over a hundred years, quality trout fishing has become a proud part of the Kiwi outdoor heritage. Generations of anglers have considered it a birthright and one of the important joys of living or visiting NZ. It has become an intense source of well deserved national pride. Important as they are, can the same be said for any of the indigenous fish?

In addition and on a more pragmatic side, a robust NZ trout fishery is the envy of most nations for the high margin revenue it generates. Few countries can attract a steady flow of thousands of overseas anglers spending tens of thousands of dollars per season and many of them return year after year. Easy, high profit and likely non-replaceable revenue, especially for the smaller trout towns where the best trout fishing is.

That indigenous fish are important is beyond question but the risks involved in managing them should be proportionate, reasonable, and economical. Not to be overly pragmatic, but ours is a world awash in hopeless levels of debt and although NZ is better off than many nations, it is not an exception. Every dollar of revenue is important and international anglers spend about \$200 million each season. It has taken many years to build up to this level and even more is possible, but it is only as safe as an angler's last fishing trip. If the quality of fishing diminishes too much more, overseas anglers will go to a country that can deliver what they want. Argentina is making big inroads of late.

Is it worth the risk to allow your good fortune to become at risk, even for noble intentions? Are there thousands of tourist who will spend at the above level to see any or all of the indigenous species. Balance is they key. More to the point, if the trout fishery is allowed to falter, how will the small towns replace this lost income, let alone the much larger contribution of resident Kiwi anglers, many of which travel from the large population centers on a regular basis during the season.

It is not about good or bad species, it is about balance and the Bill should be amended accordingly. Frankly, if something isn't done quickly about the water quality of NZ, the pro-con of which fish species are most preferable will be a mute point. All part of the balance challenge.

Respectfully,

Howard West