

Expert panel review of selected significant marine sites surveyed during the summer of 2019-2020

Research, survey and monitoring report number 1064

A report prepared for: Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation C/o Seymour Square Blenheim

Expert panel members:

Rob Davidson, Andrew Baxter, Clinton Duffy, Sean Handley, Peter Gaze, Sam du Fresne, Shannel Courtney

Bibliographic reference:

Davidson, R. J;¹ Baxter, A. S;² Duffy, C. A. J;² Handley, S;⁵ Gaze, P;⁴; du Fresne, S;³ Courtney, S.² 2019. Expert panel review of selected significant marine sites surveyed during the summer of 2019-2020. Prepared for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 1064.

- 1. Davidson Environmental Limited
- 2. Department of Conservation
- 3. Environmental Protection Authority (NZ)
- 4. Independent ornithologist
- 5. NIWA, Nelson

© Copyright

The contents of this report are copyright and may not be reproduced in any form without the permission of the client.

Coordinated by:

Davidson Environmental Limited 6 Ngapua Place, Nelson 7010

Phone: 03 545 2600, Mobile: 027 4453 352

e-mail: davidson@xtra.co.nz

Contents

Signifi	cant Marine Site Expert Panel	4
1.0	Summary	6
2.0	Background	7
3.0	The assessment process	9
3.1	Data collation	9
3.2	Expert Panel	9
4.0	Wording of the assessment criteria	.10
5.0	Review of survey sites (2019-2020)	.10
6.0	Site summaries including expert panel review (see green shading)	.12
S	ite 4.23 Matiere Point subtidal (giant lampshell and burrowing anemone)	.12
S	ite 4.24 Onauku Head (subtidal)	.13
S	ite 4.25 East Bay north (lampshell and burrowing anemone)	.14
	ite 5.4 a-r Tory Channel west (biogenic patch reefs)	
S	ite 5.8 a-g Tory Channel east (biogenic patch reefs)	.17
S	ite 6.1 The Knobbys (reef)	.19
	ite 6.3 Port Underwood south-east (algae bed)	
S	ite 5.9 Tory Channel entrance (biogenic patch reefs)	.21
	ite 7.1 Cape Jackson & Walker Rock (reef)	
	ite 7.8 White Rocks (reef)	
	ite 7.10 Cook Rock to Cape Koamaru (reef)	
	ite 7.11 The Brothers (reef)	
	ite 7.13 Awash Rock (reef)	
	lew site 7.15 Kokomohua Island (tubeworm mounds)	
	New site 7.16 Long Island (horse mussels)	
	New site 5.11 Tory Channel north (subtidal seagrass)	
6.0	Significant site sensitivity and anthropogenic disturbance	
6.1	Anthropogenic impacts	
6.2	Threat assessment process	
6.3	Threat assessment summary	.28
7.0	Erratum	.31
Ackno	wledgements	.31
Refere	ences	.32
Apper	ndix 1. Assessment criteria (2017)	.36
1.	Representativeness	.36
2	Rarity	.36
3	Diversity	.37
4	Distinctiveness	
5	Size	
6	Connectivity	
7	Adjacent catchment modifications	.38



Significant Marine Site Expert Panel

Rob Davidson has been involved in marine biology for over 30 years. Rob holds a Master of Science with First Class Honours from the University of Canterbury, 1987 and has presented 18 conference papers and published 12 papers in international peer-reviewed scientific journals. He has previously worked for MAF and the Department of Conservation. Presently Rob is the director of an independent science consultancy. During his time at DOC, he coordinated or was involved in many large-scale ecological surveys of coastal areas throughout Nelson and Marlborough. Rob compiled this information into the Department's Coastal Resources Inventory which was later reproduced as reports for the Councils' coastal plans. He has implemented monitoring programmes spanning up to 26 years, relating to Cook Strait ferry impacts, marine farm recovery and marine reserve monitoring. As a consultant, Rob has provided scientific information for over 900 resource consent applications and impact assessments. His company has also coordinated a marine ecological database for the Marlborough District Council. Over his working career, he has conducted over 4000 dives throughout the Marlborough area and has extensive knowledge of the underwater features and values of Marlborough.

Clinton Duffy is a marine scientist employed as a Technical Advisor (Marine) with the Department of Conservation's Marine Ecosystems Team. He holds an M.Sc. (Hons) in Zoology from the University of Canterbury, 1990, and worked as a marine and freshwater technical support officer for the Department's Nelson/Marlborough, East Coast Hawke's Bay and Wanganui Conservancies from 1990-1999, and as a Scientific Officer (marine ecology) in the Science & Research and Marine Conservation Units from 1999-2012. He has authored over 80 scientific publications and reports. His areas of expertise include marine survey and monitoring; biogeography of New Zealand reef fishes, algae and invertebrates; and the conservation biology, taxonomy and behaviour of sharks and rays. He has dived, either in a professional or private capacity, around much of New Zealand's coastline, and co-ordinated of a dive survey of shallow subtidal habitats of the Marlborough Sounds in 1989-90.

Andrew Baxter has over 38 years' experience in coastal and marine management, specialising in marine ecology including marine mammals. He graduated from the University of Canterbury in 1981 with a BSc with First Class Honours in Zoology. Following two years working for the Taranaki Catchment Commission as a marine biologist, Andrew worked as a fisheries management scientist for MAF Fisheries based in Wellington from 1984 to 1987. He has been employed as a marine ecologist for the Department of Conservation in Nelson since October 1987. Andrew is currently a Technical Advisor in DOC's Marine Ecosystems Team.

Sean Handley is a Marine Ecologist based at NIWA in Nelson. Sean was awarded his PhD in 1997 by the University of Auckland with support from the Cawthron Institute, where he was studying the ecology of shellfish and their pests (spionid polychaetes). He has a broad range of research and consultancy experience and expertise interacting with a range of marine sectors including: aquaculture, fisheries, conservation, iwi, NGO'S and regional councils. Sean has a very wide range of skills, working on research projects relating to: aquaculture of shellfish and sponges, ballast water testing, biosecurity surveys, ecological surveys and biological collections throughout NZ, Fiordland ecological surveys including deep reef communities, and benthic ecology. More recently he has undertaken reviews of historical changes to seabed and fish communities and has an interest in palaeoecology to establish baselines to inform future management and restoration of coastal resources.



Peter Gaze worked for many years with Ecology Division of DSIR, involved with research into the distribution, conservation and economic value of birdlife in New Zealand. This included a study of forest bird ecology, in particular, rifleman, kereru and mohua. Peter is a co-author of the first atlas of bird distribution in New Zealand. Various research projects took him to the sub-Antarctic, the Kermadecs, Cook Islands and Tahiti. He then moved to the Department of Conservation where his role was primarily to provide technical advice on fauna conservation work in Nelson and Marlborough. This role enabled him to bring a national perspective to local matters. Related fields of interest include the impact and control of mammalian predators as well as reptile conservation including leading the department's recovery of tuatara for the last ten years. Both roles have included projects working on the islands and wildlife of the Marlborough Sounds. A plan written for the management of these islands continues to guide the work of the Department. He has a long association with bird research and conservation throughout the country and was for some time the secretary for the Ornithological Society of NZ. Peter has now works for charitable trusts committed to conservation in Abel Tasman National Park and the outer Marlborough Sounds.

Sam du Fresne has over 20 years of experience studying marine mammals, beginning with his master's thesis in 1998. He has conducted several dolphin surveys in New Zealand focussed mainly on Hector's dolphins and has worked in places as diverse as Far East Russia, Hawaii and Western Australia. After graduating with a PhD from the University of Otago in 2005, Sam worked as an independent consultant, specialising in marine mammals. As a consultant, Sam worked closely with DoC, MFish, NIWA, Cawthron, various regional councils and several industry clients, providing expert advice and research services on a range of species and issues. Sam also spent time at SMRU Ltd in St Andrews (Scotland) where he worked as a senior research scientist, focussing mainly on marine mammals and renewable energy projects. Recently, after working for more than three years in Western Australia on mega-projects such as the Gorgon and Wheatstone LNG developments, Sam returned to New Zealand to join the EEZ Compliance team at the Environmental Protection Authority in Wellington.

Shannel Courtney is a Nelson-based plant ecologist with the Department of Conservation, working as a Technical Advisor in the Terrestrial Ecosystems Unit. In 1983 he attained a Master of Science in plant ecology at Canterbury University and before DOC has worked for the NZ Wildlife Service, NZ Department of Lands and Survey and NZ Forest Service on management issues. For much of the earlier part of his career, he has been involved in the assessment of natural areas for ecological significance and has led various ecological surveys of the East Cape, Taranaki, Marlborough and Nelson regions. Relevant publications and co-authorships include Protected Natural Area reports for North Taranaki, Motu and Pukeamaru Ecological Districts and for Molesworth Station, habitat restoration guides for Nelson City and Tasman District, and several publications on the development of a natural character framework for the Marlborough Sounds. For the last 20 years, he has specialised in threatened plant conservation and co-ordinates the recovery of nationally threatened and at-risk species in the Nelson region and Marlborough Sounds. He is currently on the National Threatened Plant Panel and on the committee of the NZ Plant Conservation Network. In 2008 he was awarded the Loder Cup in recognition of his services to plant conservation.



1.0 Summary

In 2011, a total of 129 significant marine sites were identified for the first time in Marlborough (Davidson *et al.*, 2011). In 2015, the Marlborough District Council (MDC) and Department of Conservation (DOC) embarked on an ongoing survey and monitoring programme aimed at updating and improving the database of significant sites. The programme also collects data for monitoring change at selected significant sites. This programme was guided by a detailed range of survey protocols including techniques suited for rapid reconnaissance (i.e. qualitative descriptions) and techniques suitable for monitoring (i.e. quantitative and certain qualitative data) (Davidson *et al.*, 2014). Significant sites selected each year for investigation were chosen by the Expert Panel that prioritized sites on the basis they:

- Had limited or old biological information.
- Were areas where additional information was needed for management purposes.
- Were under threat or vulnerable to impacts.
- Were suitable for monitoring.
- May contain significant undocumented values.

Summer surveys have been undertaken on five previous occasions (Davidson and Richards, 2015; 2016; Davidson *et al.*, 2017a, 2018a, 2020). Reports and raw data from surveys were lodged separately with the MDC. The authors also provided comment on site boundary alterations and made recommendations. At the end of each survey period, the MDC Significant Marine Site Expert Panel reviewed data, assessed sites using accepted criteria and made recommendations.

The present report outlines the Significant Marine Site Expert Panel review of sites reported on following the sixth survey programme conducted in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Port Underwood (Davidson *et al.*, 2020). The Expert Panel assessed sites using the seven criteria originally developed by Davidson *et al.* (2011) and modified by the Expert Panel in 2015 and 2016 (see Davidson *et. al.*, 2015; 2016). The updated criteria were presented in Appendix 1 of the 2017 report. No changes to the criteria were made during the present assessment (see Appendix 1).

Overall, the Expert Panel accepted recommendations proposed in the summer fieldwork report produced by Davidson *et al.* (2020). Three new sites were accepted by the Panel (Long Island horse mussels, Kokomohua Island tubeworms and Tory Channel (north) subtidal seagrass). One existing significant site recommended by Davidson *et al.* (2020) and



based on new data collected by Anderson et al. (2020) was rejected.

Adjustments to the boundaries of 13 sites comprising many sub-sites in Cook Strait, Tory Channel and Queen Charlotte Sound were accepted.

The Panel also assessed site sensitivity/impacts from a range of anthropogenic threats including physical disturbance.

2.0 Background

In 2011, a report outlining Marlborough's ecologically significant marine sites was produced for MDC and DOC (Davidson *et al.* 2011). The assembled group of expert authors ("Expert Panel") developed a set of criteria to assess the relative biological importance of candidate sites. Sites that received a medium or high score were termed "significant". A total of 129 significant sites were recognized and described during that process.

The authors stated that their assessment of significance was based on existing data or information; however, they noted many sites had limited or old information. Some marine sites had not been surveyed or the information available was incomplete, patchy or potentially not reflective of the current state of the sites. The authors stated more investigation was required to better assess the status of many significant sites.

The authors also stated that many of the sites not assessed as "significant" had the potential to be ranked higher in the future as more information became available. Further, they recognized the quality of some existing significant sites may decline over time due to natural or human-related events or activities. The authors, therefore, acknowledged their assessments would require updating regularly.

Davidson *et al.* (2013) produced a protocol for receiving information for new candidate sites and for reassessing existing ecologically significant marine sites. The goal of that protocol was to establish consistency and to ensure a rigorous and consistent process for site identification, data collection and assessment. That report aimed to establish:

- The level of information required for new candidate sites.
- The process for assessing new sites and reassessing existing sites.
- A protocol for record-keeping, selection of experts and publication of new reports.



Davidson *et al.* (2014) provided guidance on the collection, storage and publication of biophysical data from potential new significant sites as well as existing sites. The biological investigation process was separated into three main elements:

- Investigation and survey of new sites.
- Collection of additional information from existing significant sites or sites that previously were not ranked as being ecologically significant.
- Status monitoring of existing significant sites (i.e. site health checks).

Davidson *et al.* (2014) also detailed a range of candidate sites for survey and monitoring. The authors also provided comment on survey protocols including techniques suited for rapid reconnaissance (i.e. qualitative descriptions) and techniques suitable for monitoring (i.e. combinations of both qualitative and quantitative data collection).

Follow-up surveys or assessments were undertaken in the summers of:

Year 1: 2014-2015, 21 sites and sub-sites in eastern Marlborough Sounds.

Year 2: 2015-2016, 15 sites, subsites in Croisilles Harbour and D'Urville Island.

Year 3: 2016-2017, 15 sites, subsites Croisilles to Waitui Bay, outer Sounds.

Year 4: 2017-2018, 14 sites in central Pelorus Sound.

Year 5: 2018-2019, 11 sites in Pelorus (8), Tory Channel (2) and Catherine Cove (1).

Year 6: 2019-2020, 17 sites QCS, Tory Channel, Cook Strait and Port Underwood.

Davidson and Richards (2015, 2016) and Davidson *et al.* (2017a, 2018a, 2019, 2020) summarised the new biological data, while raw data and compiled spreadsheets summarising data were provided to MDC for storage. The authors also commented on site boundary alterations and recommended changes to the assessments of significance. After all summer surveys, the Expert Panel was reconvened to reassess the new information and make recommendations.

Davidson *et al.* (2020) reported on a mix of sites which were assessed based on new surveys from the 2019-2020 field season (year 6; five sites) or new information from other data sources notably Anderson *et al.* (2020) and Neil *et al.* (2018a, 2018b). The present report presents the subsequent review by the Expert Panel. The Panel also commented on anthropogenic threats and vulnerability of significant sites.



3.0 The assessment process

3.1 Data collation

All data collated by Davidson *et al.* (2020) were compiled and made available to the expert panel during the present review. Davidson *et al.* (2020) reported on a total of 17 sites (Table 1). Two of those significant sites have associated subsites: Site 5.4 Tory Channel west (18 subsites) and Site 5.8 Tory Channel east (12 subsites). Of the 17 sites, one was rejected as a significant site, three sites were new and the remaining 13 were either enlarged or reduced in size due to an improved level of information. Overall, Davidson *et al.* (2020) recommended the total area of significant sites be increased by 425.34 ha (Table 1).

Information collected during the 2019-2020 fieldwork season included: high definition and low-resolution drop camera photographs, handheld still photography, handheld video, remote video, sonar images, and observations (note: all raw data are held by MDC). Information relating to each original site surveyed by Davidson *et al.* (2011) was also compiled and made available including: site description, site boundaries, ecological assessment, and any data previously compiled or known for the site or sub-site.

Davidson *et al.* (2020) also compiled data from a variety of other sources including previous reports, significant site surveys or other sampling programmes (e.g. marine reserve monitoring; marine farm monitoring; NIWA's multibeam bathymetric survey). These data were integrated with other historical data and with data collected during annual significant site surveys. For example, multibeam depth contour data were used to delineate boundaries for existing sites where drop camera, diver, HD camera or other data had been previously collected. Using this approach, Davidson *et al.* (2020) plotted new boundaries for previously described sites.

3.2 Expert Panel

For the present review, most of the Expert Panel involved in the Davidson *et al.*, (2011) report and 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 reviews were reconvened, apart from Sam du Fresne (marine mammals), Peter Gaze (birds) and Shannel Courtney (plants). Sean Handley (NIWA) replaced existing member Bruno Brosnan in 2017. Sam du Fresne, Peter Gaze and Shannel Courtney were not involved in the present reassessment meeting as no new or resurveyed marine mammal, bird or plant sites were under scrutiny.



4.0 Wording of the assessment criteria

During previous Expert Panel reviews (Davidson *et al.* 2015; 2016), panel members recognized a need to clarify some of the original assessment criteria used by Davidson *et al.* (2011) to avoid any possible misinterpretation. Some further minor revisions to the criteria were also proposed and adopted during the 2017 review.

The present assessment made no alterations to the 2017 criteria (see Appendix 1 for the revised current criteria). During this process, the Expert Panel took care not to create an inconsistency between the sites assessed in Davidson *et al.* (2011) and subsequent reassessments. It is recognised, however, that some 2011 significant sites will require reassessment using the 2017 criteria to ensure consistency. Existing sites may also need to be reassessed considering information from new or other existing sites (e.g. where criteria are relative scores such as "the best of their kind").

5.0 Review of survey sites (2019-2020)

The Expert Panel assessed all sites based on the information and proposed changes presented in Davidson *et al.* (2020) and recommended to:

- Accept three new sites with the Tory Channel (north) subtidal seagrass beds becoming a separate site from the southern beds.
- <u>Reject</u> one existing significant site based on new data collected by Anderson *et al.* (2020).
- Accept boundary adjustments for 13 existing significant sites.

Significant site boundary refinements and new sites resulted in an overall increase of 425.34 ha (Table 1). The expert panel accepted the suggested boundary change at The Knobbys in Port Underwood; however, the panel has delayed its assessment of this site pending collection of more data in the 2020-2021 survey season.

Table 1. Summary of significant sites and assessment by the expert review panel.

Attribute	Values
New sites discovered	3
Sites rejected	1
Sites with reductions	17 sites or subsites
Sites with additions	24 sites or subsites
Sites recovered	0
Significant site area before the survey (ha)	1392.58
Suggested significant site area after survey (ha)	1817.92
Overall change (ha)	425.34
Sites	Recommendations
Site 4.23 Matiere Point (lampshell and burrowing anemone)	Adjust site boundary
Site 4.24 Onauku head (scallop and horse mussel)	Adjust site boundary
Site 4.25 East Bay north (lampshells, anemones and tubeworm mounds)	Adjust site boundary
Site 5.4 Tory Channel west (biogenic patch reefs)	Adjust site boundary, rename some subsites
Site 5.8 Tory Channel east (biogenic patch reefs)	Adjust site boundary
Site 5.9 Tory Channel entrance (reef)	Adjust site boundary
Site 6.1 The Knobbys (tubeworm mounds and reef)	Delay assessment until more data collected
Site 6.3 Port Underwood south-east (algae)	Adjust site boundary
Site 7.1 Cape Jackson & Walker Rock (reef)	Adjust site boundary
Site 7.2 Cape Jackson south	Reject site
Site 7.8 White Rocks (reef)	Adjust site boundary
Site 7.10 Cook Rock to Cape Koamaru (reef)	Adjust site boundary
Site 7.11 Brothers Islands (reef)	Adjust site boundary
Site 7.13 Awash Rock (reefs)	Adjust site boundary
New Site 7.15 Kokomohua Island (tubeworm mounds)	Add as a new site
New Site 7.16 Long Island (horse mussels)	Add as a new site
New Site 5.11 a-f Tory Channel north (subtidal seagrass)	Add as a new site (8 subsites)

6.0 Site summaries including expert panel review (see green shading).

Site 4.23 Matiere Point subtidal (giant lampshell and burrowing anemone)

Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Site number	4.23	
Site name	Matiere Point subtidal (burrowing anemone and giant lampshells)	
Site description	Matiere Point is a headland located along the eastern shore of Otanerau Bay, East Bay.	
Ecological description of attributes	The seabed around Matiere Point supports a variety of species uncommon in many areas in	
	Marlborough. Of particular interest are giant lampshell, burrowing anemone, anemone (Epiactus sp.)	
	and the habitat forming tubeworm (Galeolaria hystrix). These species have been recorded from the site in high densities. The bivalve Cuspidaria wellmani is also common at this site. Traditionally this species	
	has been regarded as rare, but NIWA have recorded it from other localities in the Marlborough Sounds	
	in recent years. Burrowing anemones are uncommon in Marlborough.	
Biogeographic area	Queen Charlotte Sound	
Level of original information	3. Quantitative internal report	
Date of original assessment	1/09/2011	
Report	Davidson, R.J. and Richards, L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme:	
	Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council.	
	Survey and monitoring report number 819.	
Field work (present)		
Date	NA	
Lead organisation		
Personnel		
Site Characteristics		
Original area of significant site (ha)	10.95	
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	12.4	
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m)	6.5 - 38 m	
Wave Climate	Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
Methods		
Method of assessment		
Substratum (resident site)		
Substratum (revised site) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Eine cand	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	i nie sanu	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Silt	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%) Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Important species (revised site)		
Are important species present?	Yes	
Important species 1 Species status	Burrowing anemone Conservation/scientific importance	
Biogenic type (if applicable)	conservation/scientific importance	
Important species 2	Giant lampshell	
Species status	Conservation/scientific importance	
Biogenic type (if applicable)	Shellfish beds (e.g. dog cockles)	
Important species 3 Species status		
Biogenic type (if applicable)		
Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted	The widespread existence of giant lampshells and burrowing anemones in East Bay may be related to	
Damage and or impacts noted	low turbidity as no large freshwater inputs exist and the catchments are mostly stable (Table 5). The	
	exception is western Puriri Bay were logging activities have recently occurred. Anderson et al. (2020)	
	recorded a decline in the percentage cover of red algae in Puriri Bay and commented on the presence of	
	fine sediment over remaining plant material. The impact of this sediment on lampshells and burrowing	
	anemones elsewhere in East Bay is not known. However, as fine clay particles flocculate rapidly in	
	seawater and tend to settle out relatively quickly, impacts should be greatest closer to the source of any sediment carrying runoff.	
Proportion of significant site effected	<10%	
Level of impact	None observed previously	
Type of damage or activity observed		
Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed		
Type of damage or activity observed		
CICALIFICANT CITE CLIPAR TV	Full-state and according to the formation	F
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha)	Existing and present survey information 10.95	Expert panel assessment
Recommended area of significant site (ha)	12.4	
Change to original site	Increase	
	1.45 13.2%	
Percentage change from original area (%)	13.270	
Anthropogenic disturbance	Low	
Vulnerability assessment	Low-moderate	
Key species sensitivity	Sensitive	
Assessment criteria scores	Assessment criteria scores (original)	Assessment criteria scores (present review)
1. Representativeness	M (medium)	M (medium)
		M (medium)
		M (medium)
Distinctiveness Size and shape		H (high) L (low)
6. Connectivity		M (medium)
7. Sustainability		
8. Catchment	L (low)	M (medium)
Comments		Forestry is 2 km distant so unlikely to impact this site. Remainder of catchment is stable.
Recommendations		Adopt boundary alterations
REFERENCES		Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin,
	Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819	A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to
	Survey and monitoring report number 619	and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report
	Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A.	
	2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies	
	beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229.	

Site 4.24 Onauku Head (subtidal)

Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Site number	4.24	
Site name	Onauku Head subtidal (horse mussel and scallop)	
Site description	Onauku Bay is located at the northern end of East Bay, outer Queen Charlotte Sound	
Ecological description of attributes	The site was established as a horse mussel study site by Cameron Hay (DSIR) in the 1980s, however, data	
	produced from that study was not published. The area is closed to trawling and dredging (MPI closure	
	FRC4023). Historically, the head of Onauku Bay is known as a reliable recreational scallop fishery, however,	
	locals report their abundance varies from year to year. In this area, scallops and horse mussels are generally	
	most abundant from approximately 4 m to 26 m depth, however, they can be found outside this depth	
Biogeographic area	Queen Charlotte Sound	
Level of original information	3. Quantitative internal report	
Date of original assessment	1/09/2011	
Report	Davidson, R.J.; Duffy, C.A.J.; Gaze, P.; Baxter, A.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Hamill, P. 2011. Ecologically	
пероп	significant marine sites in Marlborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson Environmental Limited for	
	Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Published by Marlborough District Council.	
	ivian borough bistrict country and bepartment of conservation. I abilistica by Wallborough bistrict country.	
Field work (procent)		
Field work (present)		Ī
Date	NA .	
Lead organisation		
Personnel		
Site Characteristics		
Original area of significant site (ha)	63.2	
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	52.67	
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m)	3-20 m	
Wave Climate	Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
Methods		
Method of assessment		
Substratum (revised site)		
	Financial	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	rine sanu	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	eu.	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Silt	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Important species (revised site)		
Are important species present?	Yes	
Important species 1	Horse mussel	
Species status	Conservation/scientific importance	
Biogenic type (if applicable)	Horse mussel	
Important species 2	Scallop	
Species status	Iconic	
Biogenic type (if applicable)	Shellfish beds (e.g. dog cockles)	
Important species 3		
Species status		
Biogenic type (if applicable)		
Human Impacts	Column1	
Damage and or impacts noted	Onauku Bay head was included as a significant site by Davidson et al. (2011) because it is one of the few	
	areas in Marlborough that support scallops and horse mussels protected from commercial bottom fishing by	
	MPI regulations. The area is not, however, protected from recreational dredging during open scallops	
	seasons. Davidson et al. (2011) stated horse mussels are known in the area but their abundance is likely	
	influenced by recreational scallop dredging.	
Proportion of significant site effected	< 10%	
Level of impact	Low to moderate	
Type of damage or activity observed		
Type of damage or activity observed		
Type of damage or activity observed		
Type of damage or activity observed		
. , p = or demands or demand observed		
	Existing and present survey information.	Evnert namel assessment
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha)	63.2	Expert panel assessment
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha)	63.2 52.67	Expert panel assessment
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site	63.2 52.67 Decrease	Expert panel assessment
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha)	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53	Expert panel assessment
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site	63.2 52.67 Decrease	Expert panel assessment
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%)	63.2 52.67 Becrease -10.53 -16.7%	
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7%	Expert panel assessment Low due to closed scallop season
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high	
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7%	
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive	Low due to closed scallop season
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) L(low) L(low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) L(low) M (medium)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) L(low) M (medium) L(low) L(low) M (medium) L(low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) L(low) M (medium)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) L(low) M (medium) L(low) L(low) M (medium) L(low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) M (medium)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) M (medium)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) M (medium)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) M (medium)
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) Non-dredged area warrants some biological survey in the future. New area captures prime scallop and horse mussels habitats. Horse mussel beds uncommon in Sounds. Distinctive due to low disturbance. Scallops and horse mussels present
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) In (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) Non-dredged area warrants some biological survey in the future. New area captures prime scallop and horse mussels habitats. Horse mussel beds uncommon in Sounds. Distinctive due to low disturbance. Scallops and horse mussels present together. Well connected as larvae spend long period in water column. Deeper areas of closed site expected to be little different to remainder of deep Onauku
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) L (low) L (low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) Non-dredged area warrants some biological survey in the future. New area captures prime scallop and horse mussels habitats. Horse mussel beds uncommon in Sounds. Distinctive due to low disturbance. Scallops and horse mussels present together. Well connected as larvae spend long period in water column. Deeper
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) L(low) M (medium) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) Non-dredged area warrants some biological survey in the future. New area captures prime scallop and horse mussels habitats. Horse mussel beds uncommon in Sounds. Distinctive due to low disturbance. Scallops and horse mussels present together. Well connected as larvae spend long period in water column. Deeper areas of closed site expected to be little different to remainder of deep Onauku Accept alterations
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) Non-dredged area warrants some biological survey in the future. New area captures prime scallop and horse mussels beads uncommon in Sounds. Distinctive due to low disturbance. Scallops and horse mussels present together. Well connected as larvae spend long period in water column. Deeper areas of closed site expected to be little different to remainder of deep Onauku Accept alterations Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A.,
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) I (medium) M (medium) M (medium) Non-dredged area warrants some biological survey in the future. New area captures prime scallop and horse mussels habitats. Horse mussel beds uncommon in Sounds. Distinctive due to low disturbance. Scallops and horse mussels present together. Well connected as larvae spend long period in water column. Deeper areas of closed site expected to be little different to remainder of deep Onauku Accept alterations Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments Recommendations	63.2 52.67 Decrease -10.53 -16.7% Low Moderate-high Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low)	Low due to closed scallop season Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) In observation of the future. New area captures prime scallop and horse mussels habitats. Horse mussel beds uncommon in Sounds. Distinctive due to low disturbance. Scallops and horse mussels present together. Well connected as larvae spend long period in water column. Deeper areas of closed site expected to be little different to remainder of deep Onauku Accept alterations Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory

Site 4.25 East Bay north (lampshell and burrowing anemone)

Size control 55 control 50	Site Pegistration Detail (original)	Evirting and propert curvey information	Evnort nanol accordment
tice temporal content on the composition of the com	Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
the security of the security o			
the control of strongload without an early and strongload and published strongload and strongloa			
les de ver la deut fout de vote de 1920, de vote de ver le 1920, de vote de ver le 1920, de ve	Site description		
sour and antificial display and source of general proposed in processing and source of general proc	Ecological description of attributes		
Circulation separation and separation separa	Ecological description of attributes		
It as a protice does not be a common protection of the common protice of the common protection			
Section and sectio			
Tripergraphy area. Triper			
Lace of edition in demanders and a control con	Biogeographic area		
Part	Level of original information	3. Quantitative internal report	
Interest of the Table Description, the Arrivantor Cryption desired (patients), but and substance) by the sample (interest causes). Field work (present) Site Characteristics Office of the Characteristics Office of	Date of original assessment	1/09/2011	
Field work (proceed) Field work (proceed) Ma Stateman (Proceed) Field work (proceed)	Report	Davidson, R.J.; Duffy, C.A.J.; Gaze, P.; Baxter, A.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Hamill, P. 2011. Ecologically significant	
The field work (present) The field work (pr			
Lace or guarantees and a company of the company of		District Council and Department of Conservation. Published by Marlborough District Council.	
Lace or guarantees and a company of the company of			
Lace or generation of the common of the comm	Etald		
Size Characteristics From growing and any alignificant size (a) Significant sear (a) Significant sear (a) Significant sear (a) Size Characteristics From growing		I	1
Signature of second of springers of		INA .	
Since transfer food of agent and to find in grant a	=		
Solitaria uses of injection and the liquid injection is local injection of the confidence of the confi	i ersonner		1
Support and specificant lists list piles (appeal of specificant lists) 202-27 20	Site Characteristics		
Substance (out of significant set plan) 50.00 10.0		120.47	1
Marine zone 1 de 2 m 2 m 2 m 2 m 2 m 2 m 2 m 2 m 2 m 2			
Substitution (revised site) Whether of memore of money 1900 comp more conditions and more condition			
Whethouts Sobstant continued with a con			
Methods Substratum (revised site) Michael (and assistance) Substratum (revised site) Michael (and assistance) Michael			
National of assessment Substitution (revised site) Michaeland (responsed and deminant VSR) covery Institution (revised site) Michaeland (responsed and deminant VSR) covery Michaeland (responsed and deminant VSR) David deminant VSR) Michaeland (revised site) Michaeland (revi			
National of assessment Substitution (revised site) Michaeland (responsed and deminant VSR) covery Institution (revised site) Michaeland (responsed and deminant VSR) covery Michaeland (responsed and deminant VSR) David deminant VSR) Michaeland (revised site) Michaeland (revi	Methods		
Substate (wollspread and demonate 39% cover) Substate (wollspread			
Substate (wollspread and demonate 39% cover) Substate (wollspread			
Substate (wollspread and demonate 39% cover) Substate (wollspread			
Substate (wolkspread and demonate 3500 cover) Substate (wolkspread a	Substratum (revised site)		
Substance (Journal of Common 19.00) Course) Substance (Journal of Course		Fine sand	
Substance (common a) 50% (cover) Substance (c	Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substants (common 30-20% covert) Substants (common 30-20% covert) Substants (common 30-20% covert) Substants (contained path or pathes) Substants (contained pathes) Substants (contained path or pathes) Substants (contained pathes) Substants (contained path or pathes) Su			
Substrate (primer CRY)		Silt	
Substrate (minor 2006) Lucitation (collection of patch of			
Substrate (Circulate plant on patches) Substrate (Circula			
Substrate (Consider of part on			
Substrate (Isolated part or parthors) Important species (revised site) Are important species (revised site) Conservation/centific importance Conservation/centif			
migrortant species (revised site) Are important species (revised site) Burnowing seminor Bogenic type (if applicable) Important species (revised site) Burnowing seminor Bogenic type (if applicable) Interest (revised site) Burnowing seminor Bogenic type (if applicable) Interest (revised site) Are important species (revised site) Bogenic type (if applicable) Interest (revised site) Are site (if appli			
Are important species (revised site) Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Goognet type (if applicable) Important species 3 Species status Goognet type (if applicable) Important species 3 Species status Goognet type (if applicable) Important species 3 Species status Goognet type (if applicable) Important species 3 Species status Goognet type (if applicable) Important species 3 Species status Goognet type (if applicable) Important species 3 Species status Goognet type (if applicable) Important species 3 Species status Goognet type (if applicable) Important species 3 Species status Goognet type (if applicable) Important species 3 Species status This applicant size is increased in the species of a species status Important species 3 Species status This applicant size is increased in the species of a species status Important species 3 Species status This applicant size is in increased in the species of a species status Important species 3 Species status This applicant size is in increased in the species of a species status Important species 3 Species status This applicant size is increased in the species of a species status Important species 3 This applicant size is in increased in the species of a species status Important species 3 Species status This applicant size is increased in the species of a species status Important size in the species 3 This applicant size is in increased in the species of a species status Important size in the species of a species status Important size in the species of a species status Important size in the species of a species status Important size in the species of a species status Important size in the species of a species status Important size in the species of species s		Coole	
As important species present? Species status Goort Expert (appellabel) Species status Goort (appellabel) Species status Spe	Substrata (localised patch of patches)		
As important species present? Species status Goort Expert (appellabel) Species status Goort (appellabel) Species status Spe	Incompany and also (necessary also delete)		
Important species 1 Species situats (Conservation/Actentific importance Species in the species of the species o		V ₂ .	1
Species status Conceration/icentific (importance Shellinh bets) (e.g. ofg.codelles) Shellinh bets) (e.g. ofg.codelles)			
Steplitable Shellith beds (e.g. dogocodes)			
Important species 2 Species status Blogenic type (if applicable) Tubeworm retunds Species status Blogenic type (if applicable) Tubeworm retunds Species status Blogenic type (if applicable) Tubeworm retunds Species status Brown type (if applicable) Tubeworm retunds Species status Brown type (if applicable) Tubeworm retunds Species status Species stat			
Species status (logent type (if applicable) (important species 3 (logene) tope (if applicable) (important species 3 (logene) tope (if applicable) (important species 3 (logene) to batts of forming and species status (logene) (species status (logen			
Biogenic tope (If applicable) morporant spotes 3 Biogenic habits of forming mounds Biogenic than the final product of the spotes of th			
Important species 3 Species status Biogenic hote pet (if applicable) Species pet (if applicable) Spe			
Itinganic to pure plan policiable Progenic (variety of species)	Important species 3	Tubeworm mounds	
Damage and or impacts Damage and or impacts noted This significant site is located on the shore slope and is a mix of rocky and soft substrata. As such is it utilizely to be dreeded or traveler. Recreational fishers anchors along this coast along was along the coast and may damage tubeworm mounds. The present level of anchoring and associated human activity along this coast is low. A more detailed survey of this coast would enable key areas to be identified and protected from anchoring. Proportion of significant site effected Low to moderate Low for the coast would enable key areas to be identified and protected from anchoring. SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Existing and present survey information Expert panel assessment Low foriginal site (ha) Expert panel assessment Low foriginal site (ha) Low foriginal	Species status	Biogenic habitat forming	
Demage and or impacts noted This significant site is located on the shore shope and is a mix of cody and soft substrate. As such is it unilicity to be deeded or trawined. Recreational fishers anchor along this coast in low. A more detailed survey of this coast it would even mounds. The present note of another present survey in the coast is low. A more detailed survey of this coast it would even or make key areas to be identified and protected from anchoring. 4.10% 1.20%	Biogenic type (if applicable)	High relief biogenic (variety of species)	
Demage and or impacts noted This significant site is located on the shore shope and is a mix of cody and soft substrate. As such is it unilikely to be deeded or travied. Recreational fishers anchor along this coast and may damage tubeworm mounds. The present sevel of announcing and associated human activity along this coast is low. A more detailed survey of this coast would read the service of announcing and associated human activity along this coast is low. A more detailed survey of this coast would read the service of announcing and associated human activity along this coast is low. A more detailed survey of this coast would read the service of announcing and associated human activity along this coast is low. A more detailed survey of this coast would read the service of this coast would read the service of the service of the service of the service of this coast is unitarity observed. Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity obser			7
dredged or traviled. Recreational fishers anchor along this coast and may damage tubeworm mounds. The present level of anchoring and associated human activity along this coast is low. A more detailed survey of this coast would enable key areas to be identified and protected from anchoring. Proportion of significant site effected control of the property of the pro	Trumum impuets		
evel of anchoring and associated human ectivity along this coast is low. A more detailed survey of this coast would enable key areas to be identified and protected from anchoring. Proportion of significant site effected	Damage and or impacts noted		
enable key aras to be identified and protected from anchoring. Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Livel of diamage or activity observed Type of Type or activity of Type or ac		h	
Proportion of significant site effected 10%			
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of activity to other areas in East Bay, Largest and best known area makes this sit a a high for distinctiveness Type of damage or activity to other areas in East Bay, Largest and best known area makes this sit a a high for distinctiveness. Type of damage or activity to other areas in East Bay, Largest and best known area makes this sit a a high for distinctiveness. Type of damage or activity to other areas in East Bay, Largest and best known area makes this sit a a high for distinctiveness. Type of damage or activity to other areas in East Bay, Largest and best known area makes this sit a a high for distinctivenes			
Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or actival type of damage or actival type of the damage of type			
Type of damage or activity observed 1		Low to moderate	
Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity of the acti			
Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Dright area of significant site (ha) (and the commendations) (and the commendations) (both area of significant site (ha) (both area of significant			
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Driginal area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original asite Change (ha) 46.6 38.7% Anthropogenic disturbance Uow Underability assessment High Key species sensitivity Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (high) 1. Representativeness H (high) 1. Representativeness H (high) 1. Sizica and shape H (high) 1. Sizica shape H (hi			
Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) ISO 70 Increase Change (ha) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores I (high) I (hig	. 1750 C. damage of activity observed		
Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) ISO 70 Increase Change (ha) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores I (high) I (hig	SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) 46.6 87.6 Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment High Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores H (high) 1. Representativeness H (high)		· · · · · ·	
Change (ha) 46.6 Change (ha) 46.6 Anthropogenic disturbance			
Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) ARITY Openic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) A (medium) M (
Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores High Assessment criteria scores High High Assessment criteria scores High High Assessment criteria scores High High Assessment criteria scores (present review) H High High Assessment criteria scores (present review) H High M (medium) M (medium) H High) H Migh S. Diversity M (medium) H High High High S. Size and shape H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) A (commentivity to other areas in East Eay, Largest and best known area makes this site a high for distinctiveness. Recommendations REFERENCES Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIVM Client Report 2018005WN: 229. Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (hig	Change (ha)		
Vulnerability assessment High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (original) Assessment criteria scores (present review) A. Representativeness H (high) H (high) 2. Rarity M (medium) M (medium) 3. Diversity M (medium) M (medium) 4. Distinctiveness M (medium) H (high) 5. Size and shape H (high) H (high) 6. Connectivity L (low) M (medium) 7. Sustainability M (medium) M (medium) 8. Catchment L (low) M (medium) Comments Moderate priority for survey in the future. Low level of threats at present. Connectivity to other areas in East Bay. Largest and best known area makes this site a high for distinctiveness. Recommendations Accept alterations REFERENCES A Reil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey: What lies beneath? G		38.7%	
Vulnerability assessment High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (original) Assessment criteria scores (present review) A. Representativeness H (high) H (high) 2. Rarity M (medium) M (medium) 3. Diversity M (medium) M (medium) 4. Distinctiveness M (medium) H (high) 5. Size and shape H (high) H (high) 6. Connectivity L (low) M (medium) 7. Sustainability M (medium) M (medium) 8. Catchment L (low) M (medium) Comments Moderate priority for survey in the future. Low level of threats at present. Connectivity to other areas in East Bay. Largest and best known area makes this site a high for distinctiveness. Recommendations Accept alterations REFERENCES A Reil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey: What lies beneath? G			
Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (original) Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H			Low due to closed scallop season
Assessment criteria scores (present review) 1. Representativeness H (high) H (high) 2. Rarity M (medium) M (medium) 3. Diversity M (medium) M (medium) 5. Size and shape H (high) H (high) 6. Connectivity L (low) M (medium) 7. Sustainability M (medium) 8. Catchment L (low) M (medium) Comments Moderate priority for survey in the future. Low level of threats at present. Connectivity to other areas in East Bay. Largest and best known area makes this site a high for distinctiveness. Recommendations REFERENCES Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey: Walt lies peneath? Guide to survey:			
1. Representativeness H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H	Key species sensitivity	Extremely sensitive	
1. Representativeness H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H	Accordment criteria conver	Accessment criteria scores (original)	Accomment critoria corres (accomt acciona)
2. Rarity M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) 3. Diversity M (medium) M (medium) 4. Distinctiveness M (medium) M (medium) 5. Size and shape H (high) H (high) 6. Connectivity L (low) M (medium) 7. Sustainability M (medium) 8. Catchment L (low) M (medium) 8. Catchment M (medium) 9. Medium M (medium) 9. M			
3. Diversity M (medium) 4. Distinctiveness M (medium) 5. Size and shape H (high) 6. Connectivity L (low) 6. Connectivity L (low) 7. Sustainability M (medium) 8. Catchment 8. Cat			
4. Distinctiveness M (medium) H (high) 5. Size and shape H (high) H (high) 6. Connectivity 1. L(low) M (medium) 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment L (low) M (medium) Comments Moderate priority for survey in the future. Low level of threats at present. Connectivity to other areas in East Bay. Largest and best known area makes this site a high for distinctiveness. Recommendations Accept alterations REFERENCES Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tötaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA (Lient Report 2018085WN: 229.			
5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity C. Comments L(low) L(low) L(low) M(medium) M(medium) M(medium) Comments Moderate priority for survey in the future. Low level of threats at present. Connectivity to other areas in East Bay. Largest and best known area makes this site a high for distinctiveness. Recommendations REFERENCES Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIVA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIVA Client Report 2018085WN: 229.			
6. Connectivity Connectivity L(low) M(medium) M(medium) M(medium) M(medium) M(medium) Moderate priority for survey in the future. Low level of threats at present. Connectivity to other areas in East Bay. Largest and best known area makes this site a high for distinctiveness. Recommendations REFERENCES Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIVM Client Report 201806SWN: 229. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIVM Client Report 201806SWN: 229.			
7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments Recommendations Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA (Lient Report 2018085WN: 229.			
8. Catchment Comments Moderate priority for survey in the future. Low level of threats at present. Connectivity to other areas in East Bay. Largest and best known area makes this site a high for distinctiveness. Recommendations REFERENCES Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018055WN: 229. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018005WN: 229.			
Moderate priority for survey in the future. Low level of threats at present. Connectivity to other areas in East Bay. Largest and best known area makes this site a high for distinctiveness. Recommendations REFERENCES Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229.		L (low)	M (medium)
resent. Connectivity to other areas in East Bay. Largest and best known area makes this site a high for distinctiveness. Recommendations REFERENCES Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229.			
REFERENCES Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. A, Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to			
REFERENCES Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide			
REFERENCES Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide	Recommendations		
Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide			
Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide	REFERENCES	Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a.	Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin.
survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide			
to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report			to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report
2018085WN: 118.			

Site 5.4 a-r Tory Channel west (biogenic patch reefs)

Site Contract Site Contract Freeze	Cita Danistration Date: (/ minimal)	Francisco de la constanta de l	5
this control is not control in the c	Site Registration Detail (original) Site number	Existing and present survey information 5.4 a-r	Expert panel assessment
Transport interactions and section of the control o	Site name	Tory Channel west (biogenic patch reefs)	
Section of the control of the contro	Site description		
Segments are all political tests when two regions for the political forms and	Ecological importance		
Belief and Continue that are a results young and project and command and that well also a ship in a continue to the continue of the continue			
Book the year point accorded foliagened to belief of female, processes progress, profession and control of processes processed of processes processes processed of processes			
over of mourantees and east desired includes of JERN control. Structured in 20 points of JERN control. Structured in 1995 (1995)		flows, they support a variety of biogenic habitat-forming species including bryozoans, sponges, hydroids and	
Infrare and a title active of function from the laption over more 20 Pt % of 20 Seption Let of laption income supply accounts on a part of the control of t			
Learned a region formerwood systems of the control			
Learned a region formerwood systems of the control	Biogeographic area	Tory Channel	
protection of the control of the con	Level of original information		
A process work			
Present work Less organization The Section of Contractive Contra		Marlborough Sounds. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for New Zealand King Salmon Limited. Survey	
And the control of th		and monitoring report no. 857.	
And the control of th	Present work		
Size Characteristics	Date	Adjust boundaries based on existing data.	
This characteristics Thipsel are any implicant to the July Expert or rection of significant to the July Expert	Lead organisation		
Substrate function of significant ties buy logical growth of the continued of significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties and significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties buy	Area surveyed	Rob Davidson	
Substrate function of significant ties buy logical growth of the continued of significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties and significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties and significant ties buy logical from office of significant ties buy			
Supposed and specification size of the continuous closes of the continu		NA .	
Section of protein the protein of the protein the protein the protein of the protein the			
Substitution (Toughouse and distinction of the Control of the Cont	Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Substitution (revised site) Substitution (revised disconnect 98 (50 coef) Substitution (revised site) Substitution (revised site)	Depth range (m) Wave Climate		
Silvations (protegored and deminant APIS, record (plantable) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (protegored) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (plantable) Silvations (plantable) and deminant APIS (p			
sidestates in bestigned and document MSC covery discharters (common 18-10% Covery) dis	Substratum (revised site)	I Casanta	
Substrate (common 19-00% cover) Substrate (common 19-00% cover	Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Granue	
Sickers (common 39-50% covered) Substrates (common	Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Scientification (contents of 20% County) (Scientification (contents)	Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substitute (coming coming comi	Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Dead plokeli sileli	
Cobbine Cobine C	Substrata (minor <30%)		
Substrate (Including path) Regional species (revised site) Important species (revised site) Important species (revised site) Regional species status Regional species			
Important species (revised site) Are important species (revised site) Are important species present? Signer mounds (bryoscans, sponges, hydroids) Signer inter biogenic (variety of species) Signer interes biogenic (variety of species) Signer	Substrata (localised patch)		
Management species Significant species Status	Substrata (localised patch)	Boulder	
Repeated and support of the process	Important species (revised site)		
Important species 1 Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis forming High relief b openic (variety of species) Biogenic habitatis of the species forming the species the species for forming the species for forming the species forming the species forming the species for forming the species for forming the species forming the species forming the species forming the species form		Yes	
Integrating policy (if againcable) promotive species 2 genetics station as the properties of the prope	Important species 1		
Important packers 2 Bloomic type (if agelicate) Wilson's direction of significant size effected explored in the properties of significant size (ba) Dictions Diction Dic			
Human impacts Brange and ori impacts noted proportion of rignificant site effected extended or support of any original set of the support of support or substitution of rignificant site effected extended or support of support or substitution or substitut	Important species 2	Inigit reflet biogenic (variety of species)	
Human impacts Tamage and or impact noted Historic driedging targeting kina has historically occurred in Tory Channel.	Species status		
Damage and or impacts noted proportion of significant site effected service of damage or activity observed price of damage or activity observed with observed with observed price of damage or activity observed with	Biogenic type (if applicable)		
proportion of significant site effected sevel of disrage or activity observed hype of damage or activi	Human Impacts		
Proportion of significant site effected leaved of damage or activity observed type of damage or activity observed survive of the common of the common of the common of significant site (ha) SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Digital and present survey information SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Digital survey information Digital survey information Digital survey information survey information Digital survey information survey infor	Damage and or impacts noted	Historic dredging targeting kina has historically occurred in Tory Channel.	
Type of damage or activity observed to the process are fully of the process are fully of supplicant site (ha) Significant site (ha)	Proportion of significant site effected		permitted in for y Channel.
Type of damage or activity observed type of damage or activity observed sold damage (n) sold damage (Level of damage	Unknown	
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Significant site (ha) Significant site (hange (ha) 2.45	Type of damage or activity observed		
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Previous area (ha) Secomended area of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Anthropogenic disturbance Overland area (ha) Anthropogenic disturbance Area associated with outcropping rook that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance). Many remnant habitats are associated with outcropping rook that appears to provide refuge from physical damage. Sensitivity Very Sensitives. Subsites support species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthropogenic seabed disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling). Assessment criteria scores (original) It Representativeness H (high) H (high	Type of damage or activity observed		
Original are of significant site (ha) Recommended are of significant site (ha) Sas 7 Recommended are of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Retreatage change from original area (%) Davidson et al. (2017b) stated no biogenic habitats of the type found in Tory Channel are protected in Mariborough and these community types are vulnerable to damage. Tory Channel is closed to commercial trawling but some dredeging for kina has historically occurred. Recereational Shares regularly anchor hist is coast. Wulnerability assessment Medium to high (bryczoans, sponges and hydroids are vulnerable to physical disturbance). Many remnant habitats are associated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical damage. Very Sensitive, Subsites support species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthropogenic seabed disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling). Assessment criteria scores (originat) I. Representativeness H. (high)	Type of damage or activity observed		
183.76 183.76	SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY		Expert panel assessment
Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) 2.45 Anthropogenic disturbance Davidson et al. (2017b) stated no biogenic habitats of the type found in Tory Channel are protected in Mariborough and these community types are vulnerable to damage. Tory Channel is coded to commercial trawning but some dredging for this has his shifterially occurred. Recreational shiftsher regularly anchor along this coast. Vulnerability assessment Medium to high (bryozoans, sponges and hydroids are vulnerable to physical disturbance). Many remnant habitats are associated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance. Many remnant habitats are sascoidated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance. Many remnant habitats are sascoidated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance. Many remnant habitats are sascoidated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance. Many remnant habitats are sascoidated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance. Many remnant habitats are sascoidated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance. Many remnant habitats are sascoidated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance. Many remnant habitats are sascoidated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance. Many remnant habitats are sascoidated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance. Respectively: Les provided and the command of the provided respectively: Les provided and provided respectively: Les provided and provided respectively: Les provided and provided respectively: Les pro	Original area of significant site (ha)		
Percentage change from original area (%) Davidson et al. (2017b) stated no biogenic habitats of the type found in Tory Channel are protected in Mariborough and these community types are vulnerable to damage. Tory Channel is closed to commercial trawling but some dredging for kina has historically occurred. Recreational fishers regularly anchor along this coast. Wulnerability assessment Medium to high (photocans, sponges and hydroids are vulnerable to physical disturbance). Many remnant habitats are associated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance). Many remnant habitats are associated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical damage. Sensitivity Very Sensitive. Subsites support species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthropogenic seabed disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling). Assessment criteria scores (original) It high) High) Assessment criteria scores (revised) High) Assessment criteria scores (revised) High) High) High) High) Comments The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recomments The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recomments Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. REFERENCES Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine sites survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental limited for Marborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 513. Davidson, R.J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites survey and monitoring report on Selected significant marine sites with beentive values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marb	Recommended area of significant site (ha)		
Anthropogenic disturbance Davidson et al. (2017b) stated no biogenic habitats of the type found in Tory Channel are protected in Martborough and these community types are vulnerable to damage. Tory Channel is closed to commercial trawling but some dredging for kins has historically occurred. Recreational fishers regularly anchor along this coast. Wulnerability assessment Medium to high (bryozoans, sponges and hydroids are vulnerable to physical disturbance). Many remnant habitats are associated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical disturbance). Many remnant habitats are associated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical damage. Very Sensitive. Subsites support species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthropogenic seabed disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling). Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high) Assessment criteria scores (revised) H (high) Assessment criteria scores (revised) H (high) H (high) Assessment criteria scores (revised) H (high) H (high) H (high) Catchiment H (high) H (high) H (high) Comments The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recommendations Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. Davidson R.I.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring regoramme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with be entitive view. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council. Survey and monitoring proport nu	Change to original site	Decrease	
and these community types are vulnerable to damage. Tory Channel is closed to commercial trawling but some dredging for kina has historically occurred. Recreational fishers regularly anchor along this coast. Medium to high (bryozoans, sponges and hydroids are vulnerable to physical disturbance). Many remnant habitats are associated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical damage. Sensitivity Very Sensitive. Subsites support species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthropogenic seabed disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling). Assessment criteria scores (original) 1. Representativeness H (high) 2. Rantry H (high) 4. Oistinctiveness H (high) 4. Oistinctiveness H (high) H (h	Percentage change from original area (%)		
and these community types are vulnerable to damage. Tory Channel is closed to commercial trawling but some dredging for kina has historically occurred. Recreational fishers regularly anchor along this coast. Medium to high (bryozoans, sponges and hydroids are vulnerable to physical disturbance). Many remnant habitats are associated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical damage. Sensitivity Very Sensitive. Subsites support species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthropogenic seabed disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling). Assessment criteria scores (original) 1. Representativeness H (high) 2. Rantry H (high) 4. Oistinctiveness H (high) 4. Oistinctiveness H (high) H (h	Anthronogonic district		Recreational anchoring occurs in these sites and the least
dredging for kina has historically occurred. Recreational fishers regularly anchor along this coast. Wulnerability assessment Medium to high (bryozoans, sponges and hydroids are vulnerable to physical disturbance). Many remnant habitats are associated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical damage. Sensitivity Very Sensitive. Subsites support species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthropogenic seabed disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling). Assessment criteria scores (original) I. Representativeness H (high) H (high) Assessment criteria scores (revised) H (high) H (high) M (medium) A (Districtiveness H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) H (high) H (high) C (connectivity L (low) C (connectivity L (low) H (high) The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recommendations The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). References Recommendations Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programmer: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 813. Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant tres with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring proposed Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2	Anthropogenic disturbance		
are associated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical damage. Very Sensitive. Subsites support species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthropogenic seabed disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling). Assessment criteria scores (original) 1. Representativeness H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (High) H (High) M (High) H (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) H (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) H (High) M (High) M (High) H (High) H (High) M (High) H (High) H (High) M (High) H (High) M (High) H (High) H (High) H (High) M (High) H (High) H (High) H (High) H (Hig			
are associated with outcropping rock that appears to provide refuge from physical damage. Very Sensitive. Subsites support species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthropogenic seabed disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling). Assessment criteria scores (original) 1. Representativeness H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (High) H (High) M (High) H (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) H (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) M (High) H (High) M (High) M (High) H (High) H (High) M (High) H (High) H (High) M (High) H (High) M (High) H (High) H (High) H (High) M (High) H (High) H (High) H (High) H (Hig	Vulnerability assessment	Medium to high (bryozoans, sponges and hydroids are vulnerable to physical disturbance). Many remnant habitats	
disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling): Assessment criteria scores (original) 1. Representativeness H (high) L (low) H (high) Comments H (high) The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recommendations Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. Adopt new numbering to sub-sites. REFERENCES Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling): Assessment criteria scores (original) 1. Representativeness H (high) L (low) H (high) Comments H (high) The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recommendations Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. Adopt new numbering to sub-sites. REFERENCES Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	Sensitivity	Very Sensitive. Subsites support species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthronogonic coahed	
1. Representativeness			
2. Rarity H (high) 4. Distinctiveness 4. (low) 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. (low) 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment 8. (low) 7. Catchment 9. (low) 8. Assess these sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recomments 9. Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. REFERENCES 1. Davidson, R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson, R.J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	Assessment criteria scores (original)	11/6:46)	
3. Diversity and pattern 4. Districtiveness 4. Districtiveness 4. Districtiveness 4. Districtiveness 4. Districtiveness 5. Size 5. Districtiveness 6. Connectivity 6. Connectivity 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment 7. Catchment 8. Districtiveness 8. The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recomments 8. The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recommendations 9. Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. REFERENCES 9. Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	Representativeness Rarity		
L (low) L (low) L (low) H (high) NA Comments The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recommendations Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	3. Diversity and pattern	L(low)	H (high)
L (low) H (high) NA Comments The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recommendations Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R.J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	4. Distinctiveness 5. Size		
The new sites described in this site record form are comparable to sites 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4a-d (Davidson and Richards, 2015). Recommendations Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R.J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	6. Connectivity	L (low)	H (high)
Recommendations Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. Adopt changes to boundaries. Adopt new numbering to sub-sites. Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	7. Catchment		
Assess these sites for significant site status. Group any sites with the existing Significant Site 5.4. New sites should be listed as sub-sites. Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R.J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	Constitution		effects. Relative to sites of this type they are add up to a large set
be listed as sub-sites. Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	Pocommondations		of sub-sites. Holuthurians (<i>Thyone</i> spA) are of note.
REFERENCES Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	Recommendations		Adopt changes to boundaries. Adopt new numbering to sub-sites.
Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819. Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed			
number 819. Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	REFERENCES		
Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed			
benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed		Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of	
Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed		selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with	
Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed			
samon tarm sites. Prepared for Ministry for Primary Industries, NIWA Client Report No. NEL/2016-003.		benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of	
		benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824. Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed	

Site 5.8 a-g Tory Channel east (biogenic patch reefs)

Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Site number	Site 5.8 a-g	
Site name	Tory Channel east (biogenic patch reefs)	
Site description	Tory Channel east subsites are located in the eastern half of the Channel between Te Rua Bay and Okukari	
Ecological importance	Bay near the entrance. Tory Channel (east) is comprised of 12 subsites ranging in size from 0.55 ha to 44.06 ha. These subsites	
zeologica importante	were first described by Davidson and Richards (2015) and Davidson et al. (2017b). Davidson et al. (2017b)	
	stated the often steep edges of Tory Channel comprise combinations of bedrock, boulder, cobble and	
	shelly habitats that are swept by strong and regular tidal currents. As a result of the substrate and tidal flows, they support a variety of biogenic habitat-forming species including hydroids, bryozoans, sponges,	
	and ascidians. These subsites are similar to subsites located in the western Channel; however, the	
	composition of biogenic species is distinct, the most notable difference being the abundance of hydroid	
	trees (Solanderia ericopsis) in the eastern areas of Tory Channel, particularly along the northern side of the Channel between Ngamahau and Fishermans Bay.	
	Davidson and Richards (2015) stated these sites also often included shallow reef habitats with a high cover	
	of macroalgae. Based on a recommended threshold of 10%, Davidson et al. (2017b) suggested the addition	
Biogeographic area	of new sub-sites at several locations (mean biogenic cover was 37.8 %, + /- 24.7 SD). Tory Channel	
Level of original information	2. Qualitative internal report	
Date of original assessment	2016	
Report	Brown S, Anderson TJ, Watts A, Carter M, Olsen L, Bradley A 2016. Benthic ecological assessments for proposed salmon farm sites. Prepared for Ministry for Primary Industries, NIWA Client Report No. NEL2016-	
	003.	
Present work	Ton or a second second	
Date	Adjust boundaries based on existing data.	
Lead organisation Personnel	Davidson Environmental Rob Davidson	
Area surveyed		
Sito Characteristics		
Site Characteristics Original area of significant site (ha)	NA	
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	NA NA	
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m) Wave Climate	2-45 m Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
Trans climate	Shertered country (enclosed of senin-enclosed water body)	
Substratum (revised site)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Coarse sand	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover) Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%)	Shell hash	
Substrata (localised patch)	Cobble	
Substrata (localised patch) Substrata (localised patch)	Bedrock Boulder	
Substrata (localiseu patcii)	Boulder	
Important species (revised site)		
Are important species present?	Yes	
Important species 1	Biogenic mounds (bryozoans, sponges, hydroids)	
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable)	Biogenic habitat forming High relief biogenic (variety of species)	
Important species 2	Hydroid trees	
Species status	Biogenic habitat forming	
Biogenic type (if applicable)	Hydroid garden	
Human Impacts		
Damage and or impacts noted	Davidson et al. (2017b) stated no biogenic habitats of the type found in Tory Channel are protected in	
	Marlborough and these community types are vulnerable to damage. Tory Channel is closed to commercial trawling but some dredging for kina has historically occurred. recreational anchoring occurs and likely	
	cause damage to biogenic communities.	
Proportion of significant site effected		
Level of damage	Unknown	
Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	Anchoring	
Type of damage or activity observed		
Type of damage or activity observed		
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Original area of significant site (ha)	122.92	
Sites	4444	
Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site	114.11 Decrease	
Change (ha)	7.34	
Percentage change from original area (%)	0.1	
Anthropogenic disturbance	Kina dredging may occur. Three salmon farms are located along the edges of the main reach. Several mussel farms are located in adjacent bays to the main reach. Pine plantations are widespread in most	Recreational anchoring occurs and likely damages biogenic structures.
	catchments of the bays along Tory Channel. The intertidal and shallow subtidal received wakes from ferry	
Vulnerability assessment	Very sensitive. Subsites support species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthropogenic	
	seabed disturbance (i.e. anchoring, all forms of dredging and trawling).	
Assessment criteria scores (original) 1. Representativeness		Assessment criteria scores (revised) H (high)
2. Rarity		M (medium)
3. Diversity		H (high)
4. Distinctiveness 5. Size		H (high) H (high)
6. Connectivity	H (high)	H (high)
7. Catchment	L(low)	NA
Comments		Largest sites of their type known.
Recommendations		Accept boundary adjustments. Tidal flow negates adjacent catchment
		effects.
REFERENCES	Davidson R.J.; Richards L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-	
	2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819.	
	Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015.	
	Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements	
	Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Mariborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824.	

Site 6.1 The Knobbys (reef)

To be assessed by expert panel once more data is collected.



The Knobbys (left), adjacent coast and nearby mussel farm.



The Knobbys original 2011 significant site (yellow) and the boundary suggested by Davidson *et al.* (2020) (teal).

Site 6.3 Port Underwood south-east (algae bed)

Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Site number	6.3	Expert paner assessment
Site name	Site 6.3 Port Underwood south-east (algae bed)	
Site description	Area of seabed located along the south-eastern shoreline of Port Underwood between Robertson Point and	
Ecological description of attributes	Pipi Bay. Red algae was described from this area by Davidson <i>et al</i> . (2011). Since that time a number of surveys and	
	red algae monitoring reports have been produced in relation to this coast. Much of this area supports a	
	variety of species of macroalgae including a variety of red algae species. Davidson (2015) stated that red	
	algae beds described by Davidson (2013, 2013a) were characterised by a range of species that appeared to vary geographically from north to south. Stations located in the north-east were dominated by a different	
	set of red algae species compared to stations located further to the south and west. In the north, one of the	
	dominant species is the adventive Chnoospora minima which is a brown alga but forms a mat over the	
	benthos (Nelson and Duffy, 1991). Centrally, the red algae Adamsiella spp. are often abundant and, further south, appears to be <i>Rhodymenia</i> sp.	
Di		
Biogeographic area Level of original information	Port Underwood 3. Quantitative internal report	
Date of original assessment	1/09/2011	
Report	Davidson R. J.; Duffy C.A.J.; Gaze P.; Baxter, A.; DuFresne S.; Courtney S.; Hamill P. 2011. Ecologically significant marine sites in Marlborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson environmental limited for	
	Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation.	
Field work (present)		
Date	1 April 2019	
Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental	
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Laura Richards , Courtney Rayes	
Site Characteristics		
Original area of significant site (ha)	3.914	
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	50.229	
Marine zone Depth range (m)	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf) 6.5 - 14.5 m	
Wave Climate	5.5 - 14.5 m Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
Methods		
Method of assessment	Drop camera (cable remote) HD photographs (remote underwater)	
	HD video (remote underwater) HD video (remote underwater)	
Substratum (revised site)	The state of the s	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover) Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover) Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches) Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
,		
Important species (revised site)		
Are important species present?	Yes	
Important species 1 Species status	Red algae Biogenic habitat forming	
Biogenic type (if applicable)	Biogenic nabitat forming	
Important species 2		
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable)		
вюдение суре (н аррисавле)		
Human Impacts		
Damage and or impacts noted	Mussel farms are located in this area. The adventive brown alga Chnoospora minima (Nelson and Duffy,	
	1991) is common in sheltered northern areas of this site. It is not known if this species compete with native algal species.	
	algai species.	
Proportion of significant site effected		
Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact	25-50 % Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures	
	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson <i>et al.</i> , 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often	
	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the cathement have been logged in recent years. It is	
Level of impact	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga <i>Chnosspora minim</i> a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae.	
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnoospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species	
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga <i>Chnosspora minim</i> a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae.	
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnoospara minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture	
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation	
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnoospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation	Expert panel assessment
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnoospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229	Expert panel assessment
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha)	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minima (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3-914 50-229 Increase 46-315	Expert panel assessment
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnoospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229	Expert panel assessment
Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minima (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3-914 50-229 Increase 46-315	Expert panel assessment
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnoospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 5.02.29 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate	Expert panel assessment
Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate	Expert panel assessment
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3-914 50.229 increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original)	Expert panel assessment Assessment criteria scores (present review)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 5.0.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M(medium)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rairly 3. Diversity	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229 increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 Existing and present survey information 3.914 So.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) L (low) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (hisph) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229 increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3-914 50.229 increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) L(Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) Monitoring reports have been undertaken on the impact of marine farms.
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 So.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) L (lo	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments Recommendations	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3-914 50.229 increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) L(Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) Monitoring reports have been undertaken on the impact of marine farms.
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnosspora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 Existing and present survey information 3.914 So 2.29 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient M(medium) L(low) L(Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) Monitoring reports have been undertaken on the impact of marine farms.
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments Recommendations	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) Monitoring reports have been undertaken on the impact of marine farms.
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments Recommendations	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnosspora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) Monitoring reports have been undertaken on the impact of marine farms.
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments Recommendations	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (high) M (high) M (high) Monitoring reports have been undertaken on the impact of marine farms.
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments Recommendations	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnosspora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (high) M (high) M (high) Monitoring reports have been undertaken on the impact of marine farms.
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments Recommendations	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnospora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3-914 50.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (high) M (high) M (high) Monitoring reports have been undertaken on the impact of marine farms.
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments Recommendations	Annual monitoring of algae beds in this area has shown that algae grows under marine farm structures (Davidson et al., 2019). Sedimentation levels appear high as indicated by high turbidity and sediment often dusting rocks and plant surfaces. Considerable areas of the catchment have been logged in recent years. It is not known if the adventive alga Chnosspora minim a (Nelson and Duffy, 1991) competes with native algae. Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 3.914 50.229 Increase 46.315 1183.3% Moderate Low-moderate Resilient Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (high) M (high) M (high) Monitoring reports have been undertaken on the impact of marine farms.

Site 5.9 Tory Channel entrance (biogenic patch reefs)

Site 7.1 Cape Jackson & Walker Rock (reef)

Site 7.8 White Rocks (reef)

Site 7.10 Cook Rock to Cape Koamaru (reef)

Site 7.11 The Brothers (reef)

Site 7.13 Awash Rock (reef)

See searchises See administration All Sec ACC NOT NOT A TO 20 All Sec administration All Sec admin			
Case Storm was all with a control of the control of	Site Registration Detail (original)		Expert panel assessment
included decident of all feltions in the Continue of the body house of the growth of the continue of the conti	Site number Site name		
Security of exercision of encloses and security contents of the content of the co	Site description	All six Cook Strait significant sites are located in or directly adjacent to Cook Strait between Cape Jackson southwards to the	
Search Control and Profession of Search Control and Co		entrance to Tory Channel. The Tory Channel site spans two biogeographic zones (Tory Channel and Cape Jackson to Rarangi.	
Image Imag	Ecological description of attributes		
the common designation and Assembly that is a second content to the threat the proposal and month that a second content to the content of the		throughout the Marlborough Sounds (Duffy et al., unpublished data). Diver observations revealed that species, communities	
these are an approximate of the control process of the Control and COST Control and COST Control and COST COST COST COST COST COST COST COST			
where products cannot do not be the street of those will all possible. See a convey to follow of the products of a convey to a		these are not presently well known due to the difficulties surveying these sites. Davidson et al. (2011) stated these areas	
Impact Power at the was againteen because Can both which intered control and the part of t		were poorly known due to strong tidal flows and depths. Diver surveys by Duffy et al. (unpublished data) recorded an	
Common or concept and shidlered to Anticherough, and reflect actually on compared and shidlered to Anticherough and shidlered to Anticherough and the compared and shidlered to Anticherough and shidlered to Anticher			
device or one of a filt in the actions of an equal of two actions are of a filt or action of the control particular of the		common or widespread habitat in Marlborough, and they supported a distinct range of species, usually in very high	
Secretary of the control of the cont			
Incident accounts of interior of depth incidence and of all of the Code South Inch. To high plate and bad many to as well of defining and incidence and in			
Section Continued to the control of the control o		enabled accurate plotting of depth contours at all of the Cook Strait sites. This high detail bathymetry was used to delineate	
Control Cont			
Security of segment of the control and segment of segment of the control and segment of			
interest seated for the state of the state o		recommendations from the significant site expert review panel. Anderson et al. (2020) investigated many of the Cook Strait	
sequential content on the content of			
which shop any laby between a percentage of which any file shop and shape and shape any file shop and shape any file shape and sha		comprised extremely high-relief reefs with rock walls, ridgelines, ledges, and steep ravines up to ≤10 m up to 40 m in height	
Substratement provided study Control (1997) And (1997)			
implications over accided from With Private Labor Local School, From Whith Each accides, From Whith Each accides, From Whith Each accides, From Whith Each accides and accided and expending accident and accident			
Section of Line Content of L		meadows were recorded from Waihi Point at Cape Jackson, from White Rocks south to Cook Strait reefs located either side of	
Substricted by reviewers of 1, 2000 per common of 1000 per common of		the entrance into Tory Channel. The sponge Ecionemia alata is a common species known to grow up to 1 m in diameter and its	
Port Usalimonia (Suppose and Suppose and			
Security	Biogeographic area		
Size Characteristics Operation 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	Level of original information	3. Quantitative internal report	
Self-Characteristics SIGN-Characteristics	Date of original assessment		
Significant and Conservation. Suppress of control of large file of the large fil	Report	Marlborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson environmental limited for Marlborough District Council and	
Total part and a figerificant size (bit) Substrated in control of			
Total part and a figerificant size (bit) Substrated in control of			
Total part and a figerificant size (bit) Substrated in control of	Site Characteristics		
Section Companies Sect	Original area of significant site (ha)		
Substrate (mexical state) Substrate (mexical st	Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	1233.8	
Substrate (revised site) Substrate (revised			
Substrate in (revised site) Abortast and indicators of disclarate in di	Wave Climate		
Sicilation (solidation of solidation of solidation of solidation (solidation of solidation of solida			
Substants (universary and discriment 3900 covery) Substants (universary 3900 covery) S	Substratum (revised site)	Dadical.	
Sisterated (control scored and deministrat 500s covery) Sisterated (common 30-50s covery) Sisterated (common		Bedrock	
Sidestrate (common 35-20% covery) Sidestrate (common 35-20% covery) Sidestrate (common 35-20% covery) Combine (common 35-20% covery) Sidestrate (common	Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substants (common 38-50% cover) Substants (common 38-50% cover) Substants (common 38-50% cover) Substants (collised patch or patches) Substants (collised patches) Substants (coll	Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Soldstrate (minor CSD)			
Substrate (collated patch or patches) (butterale (collated patches) (butter	Substrata (minor <30%)		
Substrate (localized patch or patches) Doed broken shell Shell hash	Substrata (minor <30%)		
Important species Impo			
And important species (revised site) And important species present? And important species present? And important species present? Species status Biogenic by pet (if applicable) Biogenic high relief biogenic (variety of species) Biogenic high relief biogenic development of the species and those little vacue damage to biogenic highest discussion of species of impact damage of activity observed and photogenic disturbance and continuous damages of the special highest damages to biogenic highest discussion of the species and applications to the high relief biogenic damages of activity observed Biogenic disturbance University observed Biogenic disturbance University observed Biogenic disturbance University observed and photogenic disturbance and	Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Accommendate species present? Ves Large sponges including bleached variety Large profit of the part of papilitable) Homeone type (if applicable) The sites support sensitive species, communities and blogenic habitats. The presence of rocky substratum reduces the risk of physical damage from dredging and traving. The sites is cocasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring saddom strength. The sites support sensitive species, communities and blogenic habitats. The presence of rocky substratum reduces the risk of physical damage from dredging and traving. The sites is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring saddom strength. The sites are west by strong current reducing the blackhood of sediments reflecting the blackhood of sediments reflecting the blackhood of sediments (Carp plan we displayed in some of rispective blackhood. Like to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many posts can be deployed. Like to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many posts can be deployed. Like to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many posts can be deployed. Like to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many posts can be deployed. Like to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many posts can be deployed. Like to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many posts can be deployed. Like to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many posts can be deployed. Like to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many posts can be deployed. Like to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites was the many posts can be deployed. Like t			
Important species 1 Surges sponges including bleached wariety goods as tabus. Consevantion/clearfild: important species 1 Surges sponges including bleached wariety species 2 Surges data status. Consevantion/clearfild: importance (high relief biogenic type (if applicable) important species 1 Surges (if applicable) important species (if applicable) important	Important species (revised site)	Vac	
Species status (conservation/scentific importance (higherical to species) (species) (s			
Integration species 2 Biogenic high current communities Conservation Appetitude Conserva	Species status	Conservation/scientific importance	
Species status (Conservation/scentific importance lingionic type (if applicable) Demogration of imports noted Description of several process of the several process of t	Biogenic type (if applicable)		
Important species 3 Species status Blooken't byte (if applicable) Withman Impacts Damage and or impacts noted physical damage from dredging and trawling. The sites support sensitive species, communities and biogenic habitats. The presence of rocky substratum reduces the risk of physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring soldom strempted. The sites are sweep by strong currents reducing the like lihood of sediments smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of fives sites and these like loads cause damage to be objective habitats. Usely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Type of damage or activity observed type of damage or activity observed type of damage or activity observed type of damage or activity observed. Type of damage or activity observed type of damage or activity observed. Significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (h	Species status		
Human Impacts	Biogenic type (if applicable)	High relief biogenic (variety of species)	
Human Impacts Damage and or impact noted	IIIIIpurtant species 3		
Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted The sites support sensitive species, communities and biogenic habitats. The presence of rocky substratum reduces the risk of physical damage from one storage and the storage from the			
The sites support smittive species, communities and biogenic habitats. The presence of rocky substratum reduces the risk of physical damage from defeging and travaling. The site is occasionally used by recinal fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deep longed in a site of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Used to make the self-cause of impact to the self-cause of impact to the self-cause of impact type of damage or activity observed Type of the Type of the Type of Ty	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable)		
physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by receational fibers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are sweet by two greatment effecting the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significan	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable)		
seldom attempted. The sites are sweept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots and deployed in some of these sites and these sitely cause demands to biogenic habitats. Ukely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Ukely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Ukely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Significant site (ha) Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Expert panel assessment Chonage (ha) Low Low Low Low Low Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Life (high) 1. Representativeness 2. Size and shape 2. (Low) 3. Oversity 4. (Low) 4. (Low) 5. Size and shape 4. (Low) 5. Size and shape 4. (Low) 5. Size and shape 5. Cite and shape 5. Cite and shape 6. (Low) 6. Catchment 6. Commendations REFERENCES Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2000. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cook Strait, Prepared for Marborough District Council by NIMA NIMA Cleant Experts. T. pellentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cook Strait, Prepared for Marborough District Council by NIMA NIMA Valient report No. 20005081ND Representativeness	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts	The sites support sensitive species communities and biographs habitate. The presence of substantial and the state of the s	
Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable)	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring	
Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can think the many cannel of the possible substance of the possi	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are	
Type of damage or activity observed Type of Canage of Type of Canage or activity observed Type of Canage or activity observed Type of Canage or activity Type of Cana	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are	
Significant step Significant	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats.	
Significant site (ha) 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 8 70 / 83 70 / 8	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats.	
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Change (ha) Sizes 35.597 Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (original) Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (original) Assessment (high) Assessment (h	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats.	
Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Lists to original site Change (ha) Sizes and sizes area of significant site (ha) Lists area original site Change (ha) Sizes area original site Change (ha) Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores Listeria scores (present review) Mignedium) Mignedium) Mignedium) Mignedium) Listeria scores Listeria scores (present review) Mignedium) Mignedium) Mignedium) Mignedium) Listeria scores Listeria scores (present review) Mignedium) Mignedium Mignedium Mignedium Mignedium Mignedium Mignedium Mignedium	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats.	
Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (original) 1. Representativeness H (high) Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) Assessment criteria scores Asses	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed.	
Change (na) 525.97 74.3%	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SiGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Ukely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Arthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (present review) Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (present review) A (medium) A (medium) A (medium) A (medium) A (medium) A (migh) A (mig	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83	Expert panel assessment
Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (present review) Assessment criteria scores (present review) Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L (low) Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) Districtiveness H (high) L (low) Connectivity L (low) L (low) Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) L (low) Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) A (Districtiveness) A (Liow) A (Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha)	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase	Expert panel assessment
Low-moderate	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha)	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97	Expert panel assessment
Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive Extremely sensitive	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%)	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3%	Expert panel assessment
Assessment criteria scores Assessment criteria scores (original) 1. Representativeness H (high) L (low) A. Districtiveness H (high) L (low) B. Catron L (low) C. Connectivity L (low) C. Connectivity L (low) C. Comments Comments Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) A. Districtiveness H (high) L (low) Comments Comments Adopt new site boundaries. REFERENCES Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2020. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cook Strait, Prepared for Mariborough District Council by NIWA NIWA Client report No: 2019081WN Nell, H., Mackay, K., Wilkox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 128. Nell, H., Mackay, K., Wilkox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 128.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change to original site Change to describe the significant site (ha) Change to original site Change to original site Change to describe the significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha)	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low	Expert panel assessment
1. Representativeness H (high) M (medium) 2. Rairly L (low) M (medium) 3. Diversity H (high) H (high) 4. Districtiveness H (high) H (high) 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity L (low) H (high) 6. Connectivity L (low) H (high) 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments Comments Recommendations Adopt new site boundaries. Adopt new boundaries. REFERENCES Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2020. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cook Strait, Prepared for Mariborough District Council by NIWA NIWA client report No: 2019081WN Nell, H., Mackay, K., Wilkox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 128. Nell, H., Mackay, K., Wilkox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 128.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%)	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low Low-moderate	Expert panel assessment
2. Rarity L (low) H (high) H (high) A. Districtiveness H (high) H	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 1233.8 1243.8 Low Low—moderate Extremely sensitive	
3. Diversity H (high) H (high) 4. Distinctiveness H (high) 5. Size and shape 4. (Llow) 4. (Llow) 4. (Llow) 4. (Llow) 5. Size and shape 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 6. (Llow) 7. Sustainability 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment 8. Catchment 8. Catchment 8. Catchment 9. Comments 8. Catchment 9. Comments 9. Adopt new site boundaries. 8. Adopt new site boundaries. 8. Adopt new site boundaries. 9. Adopt new site boundaries. 9. Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2020. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cook Strait. Prepared for Mariborough District Council by NIWA NIWA client report No: 2019081WN 9. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound, Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSSI) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 118. 9. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSSI) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 118.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low—moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original)	Assessment criteria scores (present review)
5. Size and shape L (low) L (l	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity o	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium)
6. Connectivity L (low) H (high) 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment L (low) 8. Catchment L (low) 8. Comments 8. Comments 8. Comments 8. Comments 9. Adopt new site boundaries. 8. Adopt new boundaries. 9. Ad	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low—moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L ((ow) H (high)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high)
7. Sustainability 8. Catchment L(low) NA Comments Tory Channel is located in two biogeographic zones. Representativeness for inner Tory Channel sites was ranked as high. Adopt new site boundaries. Adopt new site boundaries. Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2020. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cook Strait. Prepared for Mariborough District Council by NIWA NIWA Client report No: 2019081WN Nell, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSSI) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 128. Nell, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSSI) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 128.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Ukely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) H (high) H (high)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high)
Tory Channel is located in two biogeographic zones. Representativeness for inner Tory Channel sites was ranked as high. Adopt new site boundaries. Adopt new site boundaries. Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2020. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cook Strait. Prepared for Mariborough District Council by NIWA NIWA client report No: 2019081WN Nell, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura fe Nu (HSSI) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 128. Nell, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSSI) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 128.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity assessment Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low Low—moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high)
REFERENCES Adopt new site boundaries. Adopt new site boundaries. Adopt new site boundaries. Adopt new boundaries.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high)
REFERENCES Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2020. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cook Strait. Prepared for Mariborough District Council by MINA NIWA client report No: 201981W0 Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 118.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high)
Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2020. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cook Strait. Prepared for Marlborough District Council by NiWA NIWA client report No: 2019081WN Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 118.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) Tory Channel is located in two biogeographic zones. Representativeness for inner Tory Channel sites was
and Cook Strait. Prepared for Mariborough District Council by NIWA NIWA Client report No: 2019081WN Nell, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. Nell, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report 201808SWN: 118.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low—moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) NA Tory Channel is located in two biogeographic zones. Representativeness for inner Tory Channel sites was ranked as high.
Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (H551) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (H551) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 118.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low—moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) NA Tory Channel is located in two biogeographic zones. Representativeness for inner Tory Channel sites was ranked as high.
Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HSS1) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report 201808SWN: 118.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment Comments	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Low Low Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) Adopt new site boundaries. Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2020. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) NA Tory Channel is located in two biogeographic zones. Representativeness for inner Tory Channel sites was ranked as high.
graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229. Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 118.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity Assessment compact of the damage	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) Adopt new site boundaries. Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2020. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cook Strait. Prepared for Mariborough District Council by NIWA NIWA client report No: 2019081WN	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) NA Tory Channel is located in two biogeographic zones. Representativeness for inner Tory Channel sites was ranked as high.
Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 118.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity Assessment compact of the damage	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Low Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) Adopt new site boundaries. Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2020. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cost Trait. Prepared for Marlborough District Council by NIWA NIWA client report No: 2019081WN Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallenide, A. 2018a. Queen Charlotte Sound / Totaranul and Tory Channel / Kura Te A. (HSS)] survey: What lies beneath? Guite to survey results and	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) NA Tory Channel is located in two biogeographic zones. Representativeness for inner Tory Channel sites was ranked as high.
graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 118.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity Assessment compact of the damage	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 107.83 1233.8 107.83 1233.8 107.83 108.82 109.83 109.8	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) NA Tory Channel is located in two biogeographic zones. Representativeness for inner Tory Channel sites was ranked as high.
Kelly, M., Herr, B. (2015) 'Splendid sponges' a guide to the sponges of New Zealand. Version 1: 72.	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity Assessment compact of the damage	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are swept by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Low Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high) H (high) L (low) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) Adopt new site boundaries. Anderson, T.; Stewart, R.; D'Archino, R.; Stead J.; Eton, N. 2020. Life on the seafloor in Queen Charlotte Sound, Tory Channel and Cook Strait. Prepared for Mariborough District Council by NIWA NIWA Client report No: 2019081WN Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a. Queen Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b. Queen	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) NA Tory Channel is located in two biogeographic zones. Representativeness for inner Tory Channel sites was ranked as high.
	Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity Assessment compact of the damage	physical damage from dredging and trawling. The site is occasionally used by recreational fishers, however, anchoring seldom attempted. The sites are sweye by strong currents reducing the likelihood of sediment smothering. Cray pots are deployed in some of these sites and these likely cause damage to biogenic habitats. Likely to be low in most areas, may be higher in Tory Channel sites where many pots can be deployed. Existing and present survey information 707.83 1233.8 Increase 525.97 74.3% Low Low-moderate Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) H (high) L (low) H (high) L (low) L	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) NA Tory Channel is located in two biogeographic zones. Representativeness for inner Tory Channel sites was ranked as high.

New site 7.15 Kokomohua Island (tubeworm mounds)

Site Registration Detail (original) Site number	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Site number Site name	7.15 Kokomohua Island (tubeworms)	
Site description	Small area of seabed located immediately east of Kokomohua Island.	
Ecological description of attributes	Occasional Galeolaria tubeworm mounds were first observed in 1993 from this area as part of the annual	
	marine reserve monitoring programme. In recent years the tubeworms have grown and formed a dense bed. Video footage was collected in summer 2018. The present survey in May 2020 used drop camera to	
	map the bed. During the present survey an abundant bed of Chaetopterus had appeared. Occasional	
	Chaetopterus were present in 2018, however, they are now abundant an appeared to be growing on and	
	amongst <i>Galeolaria</i> mounds. It is possible both NZ species of <i>Chaetoperus</i> are present (Geoff Read pers.	
Biogeographic area Level of original information	Cape Jackson to Rarangi 3. Quantitative internal report	
Date of original assessment	1/06/2020	
Report		
Field work (present)		
Date	20 May 2020	
Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental	
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Laura Richards , Courtney Rayes	
Site Characteristics		
Original area of significant site (ha)	0	
Suggested revision of significant site (ha) Marine zone	0.27 Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m)	8-17 m	
Wave Climate	Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
Methods		
Method of assessment	Drop camera (cable remote)	
	HD photographs (remote underwater)	
	HD video (remote underwater)	
Substratum (revised site)	Sino cond	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover) Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Silt	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%) Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Important species (revised site)		
Are important species (revised site)	Yes	
Important species 1	Galeolaria mounds	
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable)	Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix)	
Important species 2	Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix)	
Species status		
Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 3		
Species status		
Biogenic type (if applicable)		
Important species 4 Species status		
Biogenic type (if applicable)		
Important species 5 Species status		
Biogenic type (if applicable)		
Important species 6		
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable)		
Human Impacts	The Galeolaria bed has gradually grown since 1993 probably due to the decline in anchoring in the area. This	
Damage and or impacts noted	The Galeolaria bed has gradually grown since 1993 probably due to the decline in anchoring in the area. This was once a popular cod fishing location and fishers regularly anchored. Chaetopterus sp. is presently	
	colonising the inshore edges of this coast and has formed dense beds approximately 6 and 17 m depth.	
	The status of this species remains uncertain. Both species found in NZ have been found nowhere else (Geoff Read, pers. comm.). This species is likely to be the Marlborough Sounds species that has appeared	
	in Queen Charlotte and East in recent years.	
Proportion of significant site effected	75-100%	
Level of impact	The site is located within the Long Island-Kokomohua Marine Reserve and is now little impacted by	
Type of damage or activity observed	human activity.	
Type of damage or activity observed		
Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed		
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha)	0.27	
Change to original site	Increase	
Change (ha)	0.27 100.0%	
Percentage change from original area (%)	200.070	
Anthropogenic disturbance	Low	
Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity	Low Extremely sensitive	
Assessment criteria scores	Assessment criteria scores (original)	Assessment criteria scores (present review)
Representativeness Rarity		H (high) H (high)
3. Diversity		H (high)
Distinctiveness Size and shape		H (high) H (high)
6. Connectivity		H (high) H (high)
7. Sustainability		
8. Catchment Comments	At present there are few Galeolaria beds known bed in the Cape Jackson to Rarangi biogeographic area.	NA Largest known horse mussel bed in biogeographic area
Recommendations	Adopt new site boundaries. Collect samples of <i>Chaetopterus</i> for identification.	Adopt as a new site

New site 7.16 Long Island (horse mussels)

Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Site number	7.2	
Site name	Long Island (horse mussels)	
Site description	Area of seabed located immediately in front of the Cliffs located along the northern shoreline of Long Island.	
Ecological description of attributes	Horse mussels were first observed in this area during the annual marine reserve monitoring programme by	
	Courtney Rayes and Ton Scott-Simmonds. During the establishment of a scallop and horse mussel monitoring site a	
	bed of horse mussels was discovered (2019). The present survey in May 2020 mapped the extent of the bed along	
	the shore. Mean density of horse mussels reached 7.8 individuals per m ² .	
Piogeographic area	Cano Jackson to Baranai	
Biogeographic area	Cape Jackson to Rarangi	
Level of original information Date of original assessment	3. Quantitative internal report 1/06/2020	
Report	1/00/2020	
перот		1
Field work (present)		
Date	20 May 2020	1
Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental	
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Courtney Rayes, Tom Scott-Simmonds	
		•
Site Characteristics		
Original area of significant site (ha)	0	1
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	9.3	
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m)	10-17 m	
Wave Climate	Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
		4
Methods		
Method of assessment	Drop camera (cable remote)	
and the second second	HD photographs (remote underwater)	
	HD video (remote underwater)	
Substratum (revised site)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover	Mud (silt and clay)]
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Fine sand	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Important species (revised site)		
Are important species present?	Yes	
Important species 1	Horse mussel	
Species status	Biogenic habitat forming	
Biogenic type (if applicable)	Horse mussel	
Important species 2		
Species status		
Biogenic type (if applicable)		
Human Impacts		
Damage and or impacts noted	Chaetopterus sp. is presently colonising the inshore edges of this coast and has formed dense beds at the southern	
	end of this site between approximately 8 and 20 m depth. The status of this species remains uncertain. Both	
	species found in NZ have been found nowhere else (Geoff Read, pers. comm.). This species is likely to be the	
	Marlborough Sounds species that has appeared in Queen Charlotte and East in recent years. This site is located	
	inside the Long Island-Kokomohua Marine Reserve and, therefore, legally protected from physical damage	
	associated with fishing devices. The site is not protected from occasional anchoring of recreational vessels that	
	occur along this stretch of the Marine Reserve. The site supports species that can tolerate low-intensity anchoring	
	(i.e. a rare occurrence and recreational size anchors), however, because the bed is located in a marine reserve, it	
	would be appropriate to prohibit anchoring using the MR Act or the RMA. Because the site is well mapped and	
	located in a Marine Reserve, no buffer zone is recommended.	
Proportion of significant site effected	The cite to be seed while the Landston of M. L.	
Level of impact	The site is located within the Long Island-Kokomohua Marine Reserve and is little impacted by human activity.	
Type of damage or activity observed		
Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed		
Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed		
The or demand of definity observed		•
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Original area of significant site (ha)	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Recommended area of significant site (ha)	9.3	
Change to original site	Increase	
Change (ha)	9.3	
Percentage change from original area (%)	100.0%	
Anthropogenic disturbance		
	Low	
Vulnerability assessment	Low Low	
Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity		
	Low	
	Low	Assessment criteria scores (present review)
Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness	Low Sensitive	H (high)
Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores	Low Sensitive	
Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity	Low Sensitive	H (high) H (high) M (medium)
Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness	Low Sensitive	H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high)
Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape	Low Sensitive	H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high)
Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity	Low Sensitive	H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high)
Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability	Low Sensitive	H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high)
Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	Low Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original)	H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high)
Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability	Low Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) Intact horse mussel beds were likely once widespread in the Marlborough Sounds. They are no an uncommon	H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) NA Adjacent Island is protected and stable but < 400 ha. Anchoring is
Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	Low Sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original)	H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high)

New site 5.11 Tory Channel north (subtidal seagrass)

au		
Site Registration Detail (original) Site number	Existing and present survey information 5.11 a-f	Expert panel assessment 5.11 a-f
Site name	Tory Channel north (seagrass)	
Site description	Area of seabed located along the northern shoreline of Tory Channel between Deep Bay and Okukari Bay.	
Ecological description of attributes	Permanently submerged beds of seagrass (Zosteraceae) in coastal waters are rare in New Zealand, where most seagrass beds are confined to the intertidal zone of estuaries (Schwarz <i>et al.</i> , 2006). Subtidal beds are knowns	
	from offshore islands including Slipper Is (Bay of Islands), Cavallis and Great Mercury Island. Seagrasses including	
	eelgrass are among the most productive plants of earth (McRoy and McMillan, 1977; Knox, 1986; Duarte and Chiscano, 1999). They influence community structure and function through a combination of physical, chemical,	
	and biological mechanisms (Phillips 1984, Thayer et al., 1984). Declining seagrass populations worldwide have been largely due to increases in anthropogenic disturbance (Short and Burdick, 1996) including lowered water	
	quality or clarity, nutrient and sediment loading from runoff and sewage disposal, dredging and filling for	
	navigation, pollution, upland development, and commercial fishing (Fonseca et al., 1984; Short and Burdick, 1996; Short and Wyllie-Echeverria, 1996). At present, no intertidal or subtidal eelgrass beds are protected in the	
	Marlborough Sounds.	
Biogeographic area Level of original information	Tory Channel 2. Qualitative internal report	
Date of original assessment		
Report	Duffy, C.A.J; Smith, A.; Davidson, R.J.; Cook, S.; Briden. In prep. Shallow subtidal species assemblages and benthic habitats of the Marlborough Sounds. Prepared by Department of Conservation.	
Field work (present)		
Date Lead organisation	21 May 2020 Davidson Environmental	
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Laura Richards , Courtney Rayes	
Site Characteristics		
Site Characteristics Original area of significant site (ha)	0	
Suggested revision of significant site (ha) Marine zone	1.471 Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m)	0.5 to 3m	
Wave Climate	Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
Methods		
Method of assessment	Drop camera (cable remote) Photographs (handheld surface)	
Substratum (revised site)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Fine sand	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover) Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%) Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Important species (revised site)		1
Are important species present?	Yes	
	Seagrass	
Important species 1 Species status	Seagrass Biogenic habitat forming	
Important species 1		
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status	Biogenic habitat forming	
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2	Biogenic habitat forming	
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal)	
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected	Biogenic habitat forming	
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size.	
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100%	
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size.	
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation	
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size.	Expert panel assessment
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha)	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471	Expert panel assessment
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of famage or activity observed Type of famage or activity observed Type of famage or activity observed Chamage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471	Expert panel assessment
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Consense of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase	Expert panel assessment
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate	Expert panel assessment
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.00% Moderate High	Expert panel assessment
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive	
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.00% Moderate High	Expert panel assessment Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium)
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high)
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity observed Compact of the special state of the special state (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high)
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of significant site (ha) Consider the special significant site (ha) Consider the special significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (medium)
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity observed Compact of the special specia	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high)
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.00% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) It (high) I	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) H (high)
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activity observed Compact of the special specia	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (low) L (low) Lilow) Lilow) Lilow) Intertidal eelgrass beds have been recorded from a variety of sites in the Marlborough Sounds and Tasman/Golden Bays, but subtidal eelgrass beds appear to be restricted to outer reaches of Tory Channel.	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Establish a new site and subsites because northern sites are small, shallow and percentage covers are low compared to southern seagrass sites (5.10).
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Vulnerability assessment Key species sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size and shape 6. Connectivity 7. Sustainability 8. Catchment	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) L (low) Establish a new site and subsites because northern sites are small, shallow
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activi	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (h	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Establish a new site and subsites because northern sites are small, shallow and percentage covers are low compared to southern seagrass sites (5.10). These sites are therefore different for criteria 1 and 5.
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activit	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (hi	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Establish a new site and subsites because northern sites are small, shallow and percentage covers are low compared to southern seagrass sites (5.10). These sites are therefore different for criteria 1 and 5.
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activi	Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) It (high) It (h	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Establish a new site and subsites because northern sites are small, shallow and percentage covers are low compared to southern seagrass sites (5.10). These sites are therefore different for criteria 1 and 5.
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activi	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (h	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Establish a new site and subsites because northern sites are small, shallow and percentage covers are low compared to southern seagrass sites (5.10). These sites are therefore different for criteria 1 and 5.
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activi	Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Establish a new site and subsites because northern sites are small, shallow and percentage covers are low compared to southern seagrass sites (5.10). These sites are therefore different for criteria 1 and 5.
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activi	Biogenic habitat forming Seagrass (subtidal) Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (h	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Establish a new site and subsites because northern sites are small, shallow and percentage covers are low compared to southern seagrass sites (5.10). These sites are therefore different for criteria 1 and 5.
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activi	Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 Increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Establish a new site and subsites because northern sites are small, shallow and percentage covers are low compared to southern seagrass sites (5.10). These sites are therefore different for criteria 1 and 5.
Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Important species 2 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of of damage or activi	Most sites exhibited fine sediment coating plant leaves. Seagrass is vulnerable to smothering by sediment. 75-100% It is not known if these beds have historically declined in size. Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1.471 increase 1.471 100.0% Moderate High Extremely sensitive Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) Subtidal seagrass beds have been recorded from a variety of sites in the Mariborough Sounds and Tasman/Golden Bays, but subtidal selgrass beds appear to be restricted to outer reaches of Tory Channel. Subtidal seagrass in New Zealand is found from relatively few sites. Adopt new sites. Periodically monitor sites. United Nations Environment Programme 2020. Out of the blue: The value of seagrasses to the Environment and to people. UNEP, Nairobi. Short, F.T., Burdick, D. M. 1996. Quantifying seagrass habitat loss in relation to housing development and nitrogen loading in Waquoti Bay, Massachusetts. Estuaries 19:730-739. Fonseca, M.S.; Thayer, G.W.; Chester, A.J. 1984. Impact of scallop harvesting on eelgrass (Zostera marina) meadows: implications for management. N Am J Fish Manag 4:286-293. Matheson, F., Sos Santos, V., Inglis, G., Pieldick, J., Korrison, M.; Lundquist, C.; Van Houte-Howes, K.; Hailes, S.; Hewitt, J. 2009. New Zealand seagrass - General Information Guide NIWA Information Series No. 72	Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Establish a new site and subsites because northern sites are small, shallow and percentage covers are low compared to southern seagrass sites (5.10). These sites are therefore different for criteria 1 and 5.



6.0 Significant site sensitivity and anthropogenic disturbance

6.1 Anthropogenic impacts

Ranking of significant sites in Davidson *et al.* (2011) revealed the biological assemblages they supported were often uncommon with many representing one of few or the last of their kind in each biogeographic area. The existence of significant sites or their persistence was often attributed to environmental factors such as topography or substratum providing some level of natural protection from anthropogenic impacts.

Many of Marlborough's significant marine sites are thought to be remnants of habitats and communities historically more widespread (Davidson *et al.*, 2011; Davidson and Richards 2015; 2016; Handley 2015, 2016; Davidson *et al.*, 2017; 2018). This situation reflects a global trend of declining biogenic habitat area and quality with consequential effects on wider ecological values (Thrush *et al.*, 2006a, 2006b; Gray *et al.*, 2006; Lotz *et al.*, 2006; Airoldi *et al.*, 2008; McCauley *et al.*, 2015; Anderson *et al.*, 2019; Urlich and Handley, 2020). Aside from climate change effects, key threats to biogenic habitats include bottom trawling, shellfish dredging, sedimentation, invasive species, coastal infrastructure, water quality and port-related dredging (MacDiarmind *et al.*, 2012).

Anderson *et al.* (2019) stated: "biogenic habitats growing along the New Zealand coast (e.g. eelgrass meadows, mangrove forests and kelp forests) especially those close to urban areas, face a range of threats and stresses associated with increased sedimentation, benthic disturbance through coastal development (infrastructure) and coastal maintenance (e.g. channel dredging), along with declines in water quality (e.g. increased suspended sediments, nutrification and pollution) associated with these activities". The authors also stated: "although some biogenic habitats occur within Marine Reserves, and they are afforded protection against direct physical disturbance (e.g. benthic fishing activities), they do not safeguard them against key threats from land-based issues such as sediment and nutrient run-off."

A decline in biogenic habitats in New Zealand has been linked to declining juvenile fish habitat and identified as a contributor to declines in fish abundance and biomass (see Morrison *et al.* 2014 for review). Hurst *et al.* (2000) stated: "The Environmental Principles of the 1996 Fisheries Act require that habitat of particular significance for fisheries management should be protected". Because the Fisheries Act 1996 has not prevented the continued fragmentation and loss of habitats (e.g. Davidson & Richards 2015; Urlich 2017), Urlich *et al.* (2018) contended that the definition of "maintained" (see: CBD, NZBS, Fisheries Act 1996) has not prevented the frequency and extent of fishing disturbance from outstripping the recovery potential of resident organisms, highlighting the need for management of cumulative impacts on the seafloor. Urlich *et al.* (2018) proposed that anthropogenic disturbance should be



managed to "safeguard" ecological functioning of biogenic habitats as fundamental coastal processes underpinning biodiversity and its contingent ecological complexes. Urlich and Handley (202) suggested a need for improved catchment management, along with more effective integration of marine management responsibilities and marine spatial planning (i.e. ecosystem-based management).

Importantly, significant sites that support biogenic habitats have often been described as important to juvenile fish (Diaz, et al., 2003; Dahlgren et al., 2006; McCain et al., 2016). Wilson et al. (2010) for example reported habitat degradation compounded effects of fishing on coral reefs as increased fishing reduces large-bodied target species, while habitat loss resulted in fewer small-bodied juveniles and prey that replenish stocks and provide dietary resources for predators. Loss and degradation of marine biological values around New Zealand and internationally has usually been linked to anthropogenic activities (Lauder 1987, Stead 1991, Cranfield et al. 1999, Cranfield et al. 2003, Morrison et al., 2009; Davidson et al., 2011; Paul 2012; Morrison et al., 2014, 2014a; Handley 2015, 2016). Direct physical disturbance by trawling and dredging for example, has been assessed as one of the main causes of damage to marine benthic biological values (MacDiarmid et al., 2012; MfE, 2016). It is likely that without protection or strong management, Marlborough's less resilient significant marine sites will continue to be lost or degraded with consequential impacts on fish abundance.

Davidson and Richards (2015) highlighted the decline of biological attributes at several significant sites originally identified by Davidson *et al.* (2011), including sites becoming smaller and some being functionally lost. In contrast, Davidson and Richards (2016) did not document loss that could be directly attributed to human activities; rather site boundaries were adjusted based on improved information. Davidson *et al.* (2017a) reported that some sites were adversely affected by anthropogenic activities. In the most recent studies, Davidson *et al.* (2018; 2019; 2020) reported many sites were altered in size due to improvements in survey detail, while others had their attributes degraded by physical disturbance, exotic species and/or increased sedimentation.

Some biogenic habitats once damaged and lost may not recover, but rather may shift to an alternate ecosystem state (Airoldi and Beck, 2007). Large scale historical losses of biogenic habitats have been documented in New Zealand's history (e.g. the loss of ~500 km² of green-lipped mussel beds within the Firth of Thames has coincided with large declines in water quality, increased sedimentation and resuspension of sediments (described in Morrison *et al.*, 2014a). Large-scale losses of green-lipped mussels within Kenepuru Sounds and horse mussel beds from across the outer Marlborough Sounds are also described by long-time fishers and residents (Handley, 2015, 2016; Davidson and Richards 2015).

6.2 Threat assessment process

The Expert Panel assessed anthropogenic threats for each significant site surveyed in 2020 (Table 3).



An assessment of species, community or habitat sensitivity and perceived threats was first attempted by the panel of experts and reported in Davidson *et al.* (2016).

The present assessment adopted an updated version of the original assessment (Davidson *et al.* 2020). The revised method required a site to be assessed for its expected sensitivity:

- (A) very sensitive,
- (B) sensitive, or
- (C) robust/not known.

Each category of sensitivity is given a score (Table 3). The second stage of the assessment involves the level of protection:

- (A) offshore and/or are accessible to activities such as dredging and trawling, or likely to be impacted by threats due to proximity to human activities/impacts;
- (B) having a level of protection from threats due to location or remoteness (Table 3b).

These factors were used by Davidson et al. (2020) to calculate appropriate buffer zones that aim to reduce the likelihood of damage from anthropogenic activities (e.g. dredging, trawling, anchoring, sedimentation, pollution).

The expert panel reviewed these buffer zone distances based on the panel's collective knowledge of the biophysical characteristics of each significant site (e.g. personal knowledge) and/or from the literature (including bathymetry charts), as well as information on the distribution and intensity of marine pressures such as bottom trawling and dredging.

Similar approaches have been adopted by Halpern *et al.* (2007) and further adapted for the assessment of New Zealand's marine environment by MacDiarmid *et al.* (2012). Robertson and Stevens (2012) described an ecological vulnerability assessment (originally developed by UNESCO (2000)) for use at estuarine sites in Tasman and Golden Bays. The UNESCO methodology was designed to be used by experts to represent how coastline ecosystems were likely to respond to potential "stressors".

Definitions for the threat categories used in the present assessment of significant sites were:

Anthropogenic disturbance: Known or expected (based on experts' experience) level of impact associated with human-related activities. Disturbance levels range from little or no disturbance (low score) to sites regularly subjected to disturbance (high score). Impacts range from direct physical disturbance to indirect effects, including those from



the adjacent catchments.

Sensitivity: Assessment of the sensitivity of habitats, species and/or communities present at a site. Scores ranged from extremely sensitive biological features such as lace corals and brittle tubeworm mounds (high vulnerability score) to relatively robust species or habitats such as coarse substrate/mobile shores and high energy kelp forests (low vulnerability score).

Table 3. Sensitivity assessment criteria for species, community or habitat to perceived threats.

Sensitivity to anthropogenic factors.

Category	Disturbance description	Examples	Score
A	Very sensitive: Site supports species, habitats or communities that cannot tolerate anthropogenic impacts (e.g. nutrient enrichment, sedimentation, pollution, colonisation by invasive species, anchoring, all forms of trawling and dredging).	Bryozoans mounds/field, sponges garden, tubeworm mounds, eelgrass bed, rhodolith bed, soft tubeworm bed.	100
В	Sensitive: Site supports species, habitats or communities that can tolerate low level of elevated turbidity, enrichment, invasive species or pollution. Can tolerate low-level anthropogenic seabed disturbance due to the nature of the substrata, community, species and/or hydrodynamic regimes (i.e. tolerant of occasional recreational anchoring). Not tolerant of dredging and trawling.	Benthic algae bed, elephantfish egg laying, hydroid field, burrowing anemones, horse mussel bed, shellfish bed, shrimp burrows, brachiopod bed, algal forest, rocky reef.	50
С	Robust and/or not known: Site supports species, habitats or communities that can tolerate high turbidity, enrichment, pollution or invasive species; and/or site not known to support sensitive or very sensitive attributes. Can be tolerant of anchoring, dredging and trawling.	Shell or coarse substrata, high energy shore, short-lived species/communities, drift macroalgae.	0

6.3 Threat assessment summary

Sensitivity to anthropogenic disturbance is likely to be an important consideration for the management of significant sites. Sensitive and very sensitive sites are vulnerable to human activities and management action is usually appropriate to ensure the continuation of natural values at the site.

Watson et al. (2020) used NIWA multibeam bathymetric data to calculate the extend and cover of anthropogenic benthic impacts in Queen Charlotte Sound (QCS), Tory Channel and adjacent areas of Cook Strait. The authors recorded a variety of benthic impacts including anchor drag marks,



aquaculture, moorings and port structures. The authors stated these impacts were most pronounced in inner QCS, however, they cautioned that the true spatial extent of physical disturbance related to anthropogenic activities was likely to be even more extensive than estimated in their study as the physical anthropogenic footprint measured using the multibeam bathymetric data only captured seabed features observable in the 2 m resolution data. Further, the authors stated the inner QCS has a relatively low influence from tidal currents with only very minor evidence of scouring, suggesting that human-induced seafloor disturbance may be better preserved in this part of the sounds compared to other higher energy environments (e.g., outer QCS). Watson *et al.* (2020) concluded that the dramatic increases in global marine traffic since the 1990s with trends of growth predicted in the coming decades may mean that seafloor disruption by anchor dragging becomes a major concern for marine habitats and therefore ecosystem health for shallow marine regions like QCS and Tory Channel.

In the annual survey report, Davidson *et al.* (2020) ranked all sites as supporting either "very sensitive" or "sensitive" species, habitats or communities. Threats were also outlined in that report ranging from physical disturbance from anchoring to effects from sedimentation (Table 4).

Of particular concern to the expert panel is recreational anchoring in Tory Channel. This area is regularly targeted by recreational fishers and any deployment of anchors along this current swept channel often results in anchor drag and damage to the very sensitive biogenic habitats along its length. It is in fisher's best interest to ensure habitats that support fish and their juveniles are protected from anchor damage.

Two new significant sites were described in Long Island-Kokomohua Marine Reserve. Although protected from dredging and trawling, there is no present restrictions on anchoring. The expert panel suggest anchoring be prohibited at these two sites in the reserve. The horse mussel bed was ranked as sensitive and able to cope with low intensity anchoring, however, this site was ranked the best of its kind in the biogeographic area and the panel believed this warranted a no-anchoring status.

The significant site located at the head of Onauku Bay is closed to commercial dredging and trawling; however, recreational dredging is presently permitted. It is suggested that this area be protected from all dredging and trawling. It is likely this site can cope with low intensity recreational anchoring as horse mussels were not dense at this site.



Table 4. Summary of anthropogenic disturbance and vulnerability assessment for 2020 significant sites.

Sites	Sensitivity (species, habitat)	Anthropogenic threats	Impacts observed	Buffer (m)	Main issues	Comments
Site 4.23 Matiere Point (lampshell and burrowing anemone)	Sensitive	Low	No	50	Increased sedimentation	Site is located along and close to a rubble bank thereby reducing the chance of dredging or trawling. Anchoring is possible. Logging of pine plantation in Puriri Bay has likely increased turbidity in the local area. The impact of sediment at this site is not known.
Site 4.24 Onauku head (scallop and horse mussel)	Sensitive	Moderate	No	50	Recreational dredging, anchoring	Site is protected from commercial trawling. Recreational dredging occurs during scallop seasons. Anchoring occurs. Logging of pine plantation in Puriri Bay has likely increased turbidity in the local area. The impact of sediment at this site is not known.
Site 4.25 East Bay north (lampshells, anemones and tubeworm mounds)	Very sensitive	Moderate	No	100	Anchoring	Recreational fishers anchor along this coast. Site unlikely to be trawled or dredged.
Site 5.4 Tory Channel west (biogenic patch reefs)	Very sensitive	Moderate	Yes	100	Anchoring, kina dredging	Recreational fishers regularly anchor along this coast. Parts of some subsites are vulnerable to dredging. Some damage to biogenic structures exist.
Site 5.8 Tory Channel east (biogenic patch reefs)	Very sensitive	Moderate	Yes	100	Anchoring, kina dredging	Recreational fishers regularly anchor along this coast. Parts of some subsites are vulnerable to dredging. Some damage to biogenic structures exist.
Sites 5.9, 7.1, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11, 7.13 Cook Strait reefs	Very sensitive	Low	No	100	Cray pot damage	Recreational fishers seldom anchor and dredging and trawling are unlikely. Large steel cray-pots are common along the channel edges at particular times.
Site 6.3 Port Underwood south-east (algae)	Sensitive	Moderate	Yes	50	Sedimentation, marine farms	In some circumstances marine farms may shade the benthos. Sediment levels are likely elevated due to recent forest logging. Physical damage can occur from trawling.
New Site 7.15 Kokomohua Island (tubeworm mounds)	Very sensitive	Low	No	100	Anchoring	There is a low level of threat due to the environment at this site due to marine reserve status. Anchoring is permitted but is inappropriate.
New Site 7.16 Long Island (horse mussels)	Sensitive	Low	No	None	Anchoring	There is a low level of threat due to the environment at this site due to marine reserve status. Anchoring is permitted but is inappropriate. No buffer suggested due to MR status.
New Site 5.11 a-f Tory Channel north (subtidal seagrass)	Very sensitive	Moderate	Yes	100	Sedimentation	There is a moderate level of threat due to catchment effects that can increase sedimentation.



7.0 Erratum

The following are errors in Davidson et al. (2011).

Page 62 Map 7

Site names and numbers located in wrong positions on Map 7. Fix: Site 2.29 Witt Rock with Site 2.28 MacManaway mislabeled Map 7

Page 66

Table 3 Sites 2.29 should be McManaway Rock, Sites 2.28Should read Witt Rocks.

Page 91 Map 15

Site names and numbers located in wrong positions on Map 15. Fix: Swap labels 4.22 Puriri Bay with 4.23 Matiere Point on Map 15

Page 19 Table 2

Fix: Willawa Point (spelling error)

Page 73 Line 3

Fix: Replace reference numbers 337, 338, 339 with 251, 373, 374, 375

Page 73 Para 2 Line 4

Fix: Replace reference numbers 94 with 102

Page 114, Table 8

Brothers Island intertidal should read "subtidal"

Acknowledgements

The project was funded and supported by the Marlborough District Council and the Department of Conservation. Constructive and detailed comments on this report were gratefully received from Oliver Wade and Emma Toy (MDC).



References

- Airoldi L.; Balata D.; Beck M.W. 2008. The Gray Zone: Relationships between habitat loss and marine diversity and their applications in conservation. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 366: 8–15.
- Airoldi, L. and Beck, M.W. 2007. Loss, status and trends for coastal marine habitats of Europe. Oceanography and Marine Biology Annual Review 45:345-405.
- Anderson, T.J; Morrison, M.; MacDiarmid, A.; Clark, M.; D'Archino, R.; Nelson, W.; Tracey, D.; Gordon, D.; Read, G; Kettles, H.; Morrisey, D.; Wood A.; Anderson, O.; Smith, A.; Page, M.; Paul-Burke, K.; Schnabel, K.; Wadhwa, S. 2019. Review of New Zealand's key biogenic habitats. NIWA report No.2018139WN prepared for the Ministry for the Environment.
- Bloomfield, H.J.; Sweetling, C.J.; Mill, A.C.; Stead, S.M; Polunin, N.V.C. 2012. No-trawl area impacts: perceptions, compliance and fish abundances. Environmental Conservation 39 (3): 237–247.
- Cranfield, H.J.; Manighetti, B.; Michael, K.P.; Hill, A. 2003. Effects of oyster dredging on the distribution of bryozoan biogenic reefs and associated sediments in Foveaux Strait, southern New Zealand. Continental Shelf Research 23: 1337–1357.
- Cranfield, H.J.; Michael, K.P.; Doonan, I.J. 1999. Changes in the distribution of epifaunal reefs and oysters during 130 years of dredging for oysters in Foveaux Strait, southern New Zealand. Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems I: 461–483.
- Dahlgren, C. P., Kellison, G. T., Adams, A. J., Gillanders, B. M., Kendall, M. S., Layman, C. A., ... Serafy, J. E. 2006. Marine nurseries and effective juvenile habitats: Concepts and applications. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 312, 291–295. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps312291
- Davidson, R.J.; Richards, L.A.; Rayes, C.; Scott-Simmonds, T. 2020. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme (survey 6): Summary report 2019-2020. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 1023.
- Davidson, R.J.; Richards, L.A.; Rayes, C.; Scott-Simmonds, T. 2019. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme (survey 5): Summary report 2018-2019. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 943.
- Davidson, R.J.; Richards, L.A.; Rayes, C.; Scott-Simmonds, T. 2018a. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme (survey 4): Summary report 2017-2018. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 878.
- Davidson, R. J; Baxter, A. S; Duffy, C. A. J; Handley, S; Gaze, P; du Fresne, S; Courtney, S. 2018b. Expert panel review of selected significant marine sites surveyed in 2017-2018. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 897.
- Davidson, R.J.; Richards, L.A.; Rayes, C. 2017a. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme (Survey 3): Summary report 2016-2017. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 859.
- Davidson, R.J.; Richards, L.A.; Rayes, C. 2017b. Benthic biological survey of central and south-eastern Tory Channel, Marlborough Sounds. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for New Zealand King Salmon Limited. Survey and monitoring report no. 857.
- Davidson, R.J. and Richards, L.A. 2016. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary report 2015-2016. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 836.
- Davidson, R.J. and Richards, L.A. 2015. Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Summary 2014-2015. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819.



- Davidson, R.J.; Richards L.A. 2014. Recovery of a mussel farm in Otanerau Bay, East Bay, Marlborough Sounds: 2002-2013. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 788.
- Davidson, R. J.; Baxter, A. S.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Brosnan, B. 2015. Reassessment of selected significant marine sites (2014-2015) and evaluation of protection requirements for significant sites with benthic values. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 824.
- Davidson, R. J.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; Baxter, A. S.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Hamill, P. 2014. Ecologically significant marine sites in Marlborough: recommended protocols for survey and status monitoring. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 792.
- Davidson, R. J.; Duffy, C. A. J.; Gaze, P.; Baxter, A. S.; du Fresne, S.; Courtney, S.; Hamill, P. 2013. Ecologically significant marine sites in Marlborough: protocol for receiving and assessing new sites and reassessing existing sites. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Survey and monitoring report no. 768.
- Davidson R. J.; Duffy C.A.J.; Gaze P.; Baxter, A.; du Fresne S.; Courtney S.; Hamill P. 2011. Ecologically significant marine sites in Marlborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Published by Marlborough District Council.
- Diaz, R. J., Cutter, G. R., & Able, K. W. 2003. The importance of physical and biogenic structure to juvenile fishes on the shallow inner continental shelf. In Estuaries (Vol. 26, pp. 12–20). Estuarine Research Federation. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02691689
- Duffy, C.; Francis, M.; Dunn, M.; Finucci, B.; Ford, R.; Hitchmough, R.; Rolfe, J. 2016. Conservation status of New Zealand chondrichthyans (chimaeras, sharks and rays), 2016. New Zealand Threat Classification Series. Department of Conservation.
- Grange, K.R.; Tovey, A.; Hill, A.F. 2003. The spatial extent and nature of the bryozoan communities at Separation Point, Tasman Bay. Marine Biodiversity Biosecurity Report No. 4. Prepared for Ministry of Fisheries by NIWA ISSN 1175-771X.
- Gray, J.S., Dayton, P., Thrush, S., Kaiser, M.J., 2006. On effects of trawling, benthos and sampling design. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 52, 840–843.
- Halpern, B.S., Selkoe, K.A., Micheli, F., Kappel, C.V. 2007. Evaluating and ranking the vulnerability of global marine ecosystems to anthropogenic threats. Conservation Biology 21: 1301–1315.
- Handley, S. 2015. The history of benthic change in Pelorus Sound (Te Hoiere), Marlborough Prepared for Marlborough District Council. NIWA client report No: NEL2015-001
- Handley, S. 2016. History of benthic change in Queen Charlotte Sound/Totaranui, Marlborough. Prepared for Marlborough District Council. Peter Hamil: NIWA. NIWA Client Report No. NEL2015-018.
- Handley, S. J., Swales, A., Horrocks, M., Gibbs, M., Carter, M., Ovenden, R. 2020. Historic and contemporary anthropogenic effects on granulometry and species composition detected from sediment cores and death assemblages, Nelson Bays, Aotearoa-New Zealand. Cont. Shelf Res. 202:104147. doi: 10.1016/j.csr.2020.104147
- Hewitt, J.E.; Lohrer, A.M. 2013. Impacts of sedimentation arising from mining on the Chatham Rise. Prepared for Chatham Rock Phosphate Ltd. NIWA Client Report HAM2012-132.
- Hurst, R.J.; Stevenson, M.L.; Bagley, N.W.; Griggs, L.H.; Morrison, M.A.; Francis, M.P. 2000. Areas of importance for spawning, pupping or egg-laying, and juveniles of New Zealand coastal fish. NIWA Technical Report. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project ENV1999/03 Objective 1.
- Lauder, G.A. 1987. Coastal landforms and sediment of the Marlborough Sounds. PhD thesis University of Canterbury.



- Lotze, H.K., Lenihan, H.S., Bourque, B.J., Bradbury, R.H., Cooke, R.G., Kay, M.C., Kidwell, S.M., Kirby, M.X., Peterson, C.H., Jackson, J.B.C., 2006. Depletion, degradation, and recovery potential of estuaries and coastal seas. Science 312, 1806–1809.
- MacDiarmid, A.; McKenzie, A.; Sturman, J.; Beaumont, J.; Mikaloff-Fletcher, S.; Dunne, J. 2012. Assessment of anthropogenic threats to New Zealand marine habitats New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 93.255 p.
- Martino, D. 2001. Buffer Zones Around Protected Areas: A Brief Literature Review. Electronic Green Journal, 1(15), Pp 1-19. http://escholarship.org/uc/item/02n4v17n
- McCauley DJ, Pinsky ML, Palumbi SR, Estes J a., Joyce FH, Warner RR. 2015. Marine defaunation: Animal loss in the global ocean. Science 347: 247–254.
- Ministry for the Environment and Statistics New Zealand 2016. New Zealand's Environmental Reporting Series: Our marine environment 2016. Available from www.mfe.govt.nz and www.stats.govt.nz.
- McCain, J. S. P., Rangeley, R. W., Schneider, D. C., & Lotze, H. K. 2016. Historical abundance of juvenile commercial fish in coastal habitats: Implications for fish habitat management in Canada. Marine Policy, 73, 235–243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.08.009
- Morrison, M.A.; Jones, E.G.; Consalvey, M; Berkenbusch, K. 2014. Linking marine fisheries species to biogenic habitats in New Zealand: a review and synthesis of knowledge New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 130.
- Morrison, M.A.; Jones, E.; Parsons, D.P.; Grant, C. 2014a. Habitats and areas of particular significance for coastal finfish fisheries management in New Zealand: A review of concepts and current knowledge, and suggestions for future research. New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report 125.202 p.
- Morrison, M.A.; Lowe, M.L.; Parsons, D.M.; Usmar, N.R.; McLeod, I.M. (2009). A review of land-based effects on coastal fisheries and supporting biodiversity in New Zealand. New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 37. 100 p.
- Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018a.

 Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 1. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 229.
- Neil, H., Mackay, K., Wilcox, S., Kane, T., Lamarche, G., Wallen, B., Orpin, A., Steinmetz, T., Pallentin, A. 2018b.

 Queen Charlotte Sound / Tōtaranui and Tory Channel / Kura Te Au (HS51) survey: What lies beneath? Guide to survey results and graphical portfolio. Part 2. NIWA Client Report 2018085WN: 118.
- Robertson, B.; Stevens, L. 2012. Waimea Inlet to Kahurangi Point Habitat Mapping, Ecological Risk Assessment, and Monitoring Recommendations. Prepared for Tasman District Council by Wriggle Ltd.
- Stead, D.H. 1991. A preliminary survey of mussel stocks in Pelorus Sound. Fisheries Technical Report no. 61.
- Paul, L.J. 2012. A history of the Firth of Thames dredge fishery for mussels: use and abuse of a coastal resource. New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 94. 27p.
- Thrush, S.F.; Gray, J.S.; Hewitt J.E.; Ugland K.I. 2006. Predicting the effects of habitat homogenization on marine biodiversity. Ecological Applications 16: 1636–1642.
- Thrush, S. A., Hewitt, J. E., Cummings, V. J., Dayton, P. K., Cryer, M., Turner, S. J., Funnell, G. A., Budd, R. G., Milburn, C.J., Wilkinson, M. R. 1998. Disturbance of the marine benthic habitat by commercial fishing: impacts at the scale of the fishery. Ecological applications, 8(3): 866-879.
- Thrush, S.A., Hewitt, J.E., Funnell, G.A., Cummings, V.J., Ellis, J., Schultz, D., Talley, D.M., Norkko, A. 2001. Fishing disturbance and marine biodiversity: The role of habitat structure in simple soft-sediment systems. Marine Ecology Progress Series 223: 277-286.
- Urlich, S. 2017. A national issue of international significance: seabed disturbance in our marine waters. Resource Management Journal June: 13-18.
- Urlich, S.; Thrush, S.; Hewitt, J.; Jorgensen, E. 2018 What it means to "maintain" biodiversity in our coastal marine environment. Resource Management Journal April: 25-30. Ocean and Coastal Management 198.



- Urlich, S. C.; Handley, S.J. 2020. From 'clean and green' to 'brown and down': A synthesis of historical changes to biodiversity and marine ecosystems in the Marlborough Sounds, New Zealand.
- Watson SJ.; Neil H.; Ribó M.; Lamarche G.; Strachan LJ.; MacKay K.; Wilcox S.; Kane T.; Orpin A.; Nodder S.; Pallentin A. and Steinmetz T. 2020. What we do in the shallows: natural and anthropogenic seafloor geomorphologies in a drowned river valley, New Zealand. Front. Mar. Sci. 7:579626. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2020.579626
- Wilson, S. K., Fisher, R., Pratchett, M. S., Graham, N. a J., Dulvy, N. K., Turner, R. A., ... Polunin, N. V. C. 2010. Habitat degradation and fishing effects on the size structure of coral reef fish communities. Ecological Applications: A Publication of the Ecological Society of America, 20(2), 442–51. https://doi.org/10.1890/08-2205.1



Appendix 1. Assessment criteria (2017)

The following section presents the updated assessment criteria used to evaluate the ecological significance in the present review report. The ranking for each criterion are: H = High (which can be thought of as outstanding), M = Medium (which is still highly significant) and L = Low (which is more representative or typical of ecosystems that pre-dated human disturbance). Criteria scores collectively contribute to the overall site ranking and indicate the reason/s for the significance of a site. A site that does not achieve "H" or "M" is not ranked as reaching the planning threshold of being an ecologically significant site in the present report, however, such sites may possess a variety of biological attributes considered important for other reasons or have insufficient data to enable ranking.

1. Representativeness

The site is significant if it contains biological features (habitat, species, community) that represent a good example within the biogeographic area.

High: The site contains the best example of its type known from the biogeographic area.

Medium: The site contains one of the better examples, but not the best, of its type known from the biogeographic area.

Low: The site contains an example, but not one of the better or best, of its type known from the biogeographic area.

2 Rarity

The site is significant if it contains flora and fauna listed as nationally threatened nationally endangered, nationally vulnerable, or in serious decline. The site is also considered significant if it supports flora and fauna that are sparse, locally endemic, or at an extreme in their national distribution. The site is also significant if it supports a habitat or habitats or community assemblages that are rare nationally, regionally or within the biogeographic area.

High: The site contains a nationally important species, habitat or community; or the site contains several species, habitats, communities that are threatened within the biogeographic area.

Medium: The site contains one or a few species, habitats or communities that are threatened but not nationally, or contains rare or uncommon species, habitats or communities within the biogeographic area.

Low: The site is not known to contain flora, fauna or communities that are threatened, rare or uncommon in the biogeographic area, region or nationally.



3 Diversity

The site is significant if it contains a range of species and habitat types notable for their complexity (i.e. diversity of species, habitat, community).

High: The site contains a high diversity of species, habitats or communities.

Medium: The site contains a moderate diversity of species, habitats or communities.

Low: The site contains a low diversity of species, habitats or communities.

4 Distinctiveness

The site is significant if it contains ecological features (e.g. species, habitats, communities) that are outstanding or unique nationally, in the region, or in the biogeographic area.

High: The site contains any ecological feature that is unique nationally, in the region, or in the biogeographic area, or it contains several features that are outstanding regionally or in the biogeographic area.

Medium: The site contains any ecological feature that is notable or unusual but not outstanding or unique nationally, in the region or in the biogeographic area.

Low: The site contains no known ecological features that are outstanding or unique nationally, in the region or in the biogeographic area (i.e. ecological features are typical rather than distinctive).

5 Size

The site is significant if it is moderate to large relative or other habitats or communities of its type in the biogeographic area.

High: The site is large relative to other habitats or communities of its type in the biogeographic area.

Medium: The site is moderate size relative to other habitats or communities of its type in the biogeographic area.

Low: The site is small relative to other habitats or communities of its type in the biogeographic area.

6 Connectivity

The site is significant if it is adjacent to, or close to other significant marine, freshwater or terrestrial areas or the site is sufficiently close to other sites of its kind to enable biological interchange (e.g. larval transport, settlement of juveniles).

High: The site is near or well connected to a large significant site or several other significant sites.

Medium: The site is near other significant sites, but only partially connected to them or at an appreciable distance.

Low: The site is isolated from other significant sites.



7 Adjacent catchment modifications

Catchments that drain large tracts of land can lead to high sediment loading into adjacent marine areas. A site is significant if the adjacent catchment is >400 ha and clad in relatively mature native vegetative cover resulting in a long term stable environment with markedly reduced sediment and contaminant run-off compared to developed or modified catchments.

High: The site is dominated by a stable and relatively mature native vegetated catchment (>400 ha) that is legally protected.

Medium: The site is dominated by a stable and relatively mature native vegetated catchment (>400 ha) with partial or no legal protection.

Low: The site is surrounded by a catchment (>400 ha) that is farmed, highly modified or has limited, relatively mature, vegetative cover.

Not applicable: The site is little influenced by catchment effects (e.g. offshore site, current swept site).