

Davidson Environmental Limited

# Expert panel review of selected significant marine sites surveyed in 2017-2018

Research, survey and monitoring report number 897

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

By

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

September 2018



#### **Bibliographic reference:**

Davidson, R. J;<sup>1</sup> Baxter, A. S;<sup>2</sup> Duffy, C. A. J;<sup>2</sup> Handley, S;<sup>5</sup> Gaze, P;<sup>4</sup>; du Fresne, S;<sup>3</sup> Courtney, S.<sup>2</sup> 2018. 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.

- 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	icant Marine Site Expert Panel	4
1.0	Summary	6
2.0	Background	7
3.0	The assessment process	8
3.1	Data collation	8
3.2	Expert Panel	8
4.0	Wording of the assessment criteria	9
5.0	Review of survey sites (2017-2018)	9
6.0	Site summaries including expert panel review for each site (green shading)	.11
S	Site 3.7 Picnic Bay (rhodolith bed)	.11
S	Site 3.8 Fitzroy Bay (elephantfish spawning)	.12
S	ite 3.9 Tennyson Inlet (stable catchment)	.13
S	Site 311 Tapapa coast (current swept)	.14
S	ite 3.12 Piripaua Reef	.15
S	ite 3.15 Grant Bay Reef	.16
S	Site 3.22 Tawhitinui Bay (king shag colony)	.17
S	ite 3.22 Woodlands west (rhodolith bed)	.18
	ite 3.24 Tuhitarata Reef	
S	ite 3.25 Kauauroa coast (subtidal eelgrass beds)	.20
S	ite 3.26 Ouokaha Island	.21
S	ite 3.27 Matai Bay tubeworms	.22
S	Ste 3.28 Penzance Bay (elephantfish spawning)	.23
S	Ste 3.29 Treble Tree coast (current swept)	.24
6.0	Significant site sensitivity and anthropogenic disturbance	.25
6.1	Anthropogenic impacts	
6.2	Threat assessment process	.26
6.3	Threat assessment summary	. 27
7.0	Erratum	.29
Ackno	owledgements	.29
Refere	ences	.31
Apper	ndix 1. Assessment criteria (2017)	.34
1.	Representativeness	. 34
2	Rarity	
3	Diversity	
4	Distinctiveness	
5	Size	
6	Connectivity	
7	Adjacent catchment modifications	.35

# **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 internationally 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 an 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 a 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 35 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 Species and Threats 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 the 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 a MDC and DOC Steering Committee that prioritized sites on the basis of that they:

- Had limited or old biological information.
- Where 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 based on recommendations from the Steering Committee have been undertaken on three previous occasions (Davidson and Richards, 2015; 2016; Davidson *et al.*, 2017a). 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 surveyed during the fourth survey programme conducted in Pelorus Sound (Davidson *et al.*, 2018). 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 all the boundary modifications proposed by Davidson *et al.* (2018). Five new sites were also accepted by the Panel, while one site proposed by Davidson *et al.* (2018) will be reassessed in the future once more data is collected.

The Panel also assessed site sensitivity/impacts from a range of anthropogenic threats including physical disturbance. Five sites are recommended for urgent management actions, of which four have ongoing impacts that will result in further degradation of significant site biological values.

# 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 on a regular basis.

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. The aims of that report were 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 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, sub-sites in Croisilles Harbour and D'Urville Island.
  Year 3: 2016-2017, 15 sites, sub-sites Croisilles to Waitui Bay, outer Sounds.
- Year 4: 2017-2018, 14 sites in central Pelorus Sound.

Davidson and Richards (2015, 2016) and Davidson *et al.* (2017a, 2018) summarised the new biological data, while raw 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.

The present report presents the Expert Panel review of the 2017-2018 (year 4) survey season reported in Davidson *et al.* (2018). The Panel also comments on anthropogenic threats and vulnerability of significant sites.

#### **3.0** The assessment process

#### 3.1 Data collation

All data collected by Davidson *et al.* (2018) were compiled and made available to the expert panel during the present review. Davidson *et al.* (2018) described six new significant sites and provided new data for eight existing significant sites (Table 1).

Information collected during field work included: high definition and low-resolution drop camera photographs, hand held still photography, hand held 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.

#### 3.2 Expert Panel

For the present review, most of the Expert Panel involved in the Davidson *et al.*, (2011) report and 2015, 2016 and 2017 reviews were reconvened, apart from Sam du Fresne (marine mammals) and Shannel Courtney (plants). Sean Handley (NIWA) replaced existing member Bruno Brosnan. Peter Gaze did not attend the meeting but reviewed new data for the Tawhitinui Bay king shag site prior to the group assessment. Information was also reviewed by the other panel members to ensure consistency. Sam du Fresne and Shannel Courtney were not involved in the present reassessment meeting as no new or resurveyed marine mammal 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 criteria used in the 2017 review (see Appendix 1 for revised criteria). During this process, the Expert Panel took great care not to create inconsistency between the sites assessed in Davidson *et al.* (2011) and the 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"). A more comprehensive review of the criteria to incorporate recent advancements in assessment criteria is also being considered.

# 5.0 **Review of survey sites (2017-2018)**

The Expert Panel assessed all sites based on the information and proposed changes presented in Davidson *et al.* (2018) and recommended:

- <u>Accept</u> 5 of the 6 new sites, with more data required for the rejected site (Treble Tree coast) (Table 1).
- <u>Accept</u> boundary adjustments at seven existing significant sites.
- <u>Accept</u> new data for a king shag site.

Boundary refinements lead to both increases (165.2 ha) and decreases (-112.7 ha) to the size of individual significant sites with an overall increase of 52.5 ha (Table 1).

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

Sites (Davidson et al., 2018)	Biological features	Review panel recommendations	Original data	New area (ha)	Change (ha)	Reason/s for change
Site 3.7 Picnic Bay rhodoliths	Rhodolith bed	Accept new data	1.9	1.1	-0.80	Additional quantitative data
Site 3.8 Fitzroy Bay elephantfish spawning	Elephantfish spawning habitat	Adjust boundary to encompass values	252.6	160.4	-92.20	Improved detail of survey
Site 3.9 Tennyson Inlet	Stable catchments	Adjust boundary to encompass values, complete survey	1211.68	1354.8	143.12	Improved detail of survey
Site 3.11 Tapapa coastline	Current swept biogenic habitats	Adjust boundary to encompass values	24.11	13.03	-11.08	Improved detail of survey
Site 3.12 Piripaua reef	Large reef	Adjust boundary to encompass values	0.685	1.86	1.18	Improved detail of survey
Site 3.15 Grant Bay reef	Large reef	Adjust boundary to encompass values	0.987	2.92	1.93	Improved detail of survey
Site 3.22 Tawhitinui Bay king shag colony	King shag colony	Accept new data	0.16	0.16	0.00	
Site 3.23 Woodlands (west) rhodoliths	Rhodolith bed	Accept new site		0.188	0.19	Data for new site
Site 3.24 Tuhitarata Bay reef	Large reef	Accept new site		3.398	3.40	Data for new site
Site 3.25 Kauauroa coast	Current swept biogenic	Adjust boundary to encompass values	14.9	6.3	-8.60	Improved detail of survey
Site 3.26 Ouokaha Island (west coast)	Tubeworm mounds	Accept new site		6.5	6.50	Data for new site
Site 3.27 Matai Bay tubeworms	Tubeworm bed	Accept new site		2.23	2.23	Data for new site
Site 3.28 Penzance Bay elephantfish spawning	Elephantfish spawning habitat	Accept new site, collect quantitative data		6.68	6.68	Data for new site
Site 3.29 Treble Tree coastline	Recovering soft benthos	Reject site until more information available				
Totals			1507.022	1559.566	52.5	
Increase to significant sites (ha)					165.2	
Decrease to significant sites (ha)					-112.7	

# 6.0 Site summaries including expert panel review for each site (green shading).

# Site 3.7 Picnic Bay (rhodolith bed)

Cite Degistration Data'l (	Fuinting and according to farmation	Power de annuel annuel de la constante de la const
Site Registration Detail (original) Site number	Existing and present survey information 3.7	Expert panel assessment 3.7
Site number Site name	3.7 Picnic Bay rhodoliths	3.7 Picnic Bay rhodoliths
Site description	The rhodolith bed is located in Picnic Bay, along the northern coastline of Tawhitinui Reach.	
	The bay is approximately 5.2 ha in size and the entrance to the bay is approximately 400 m in	
	width.	
Ecological description of attributes	The present survey mapped the rhodolith bed first described in Davidson (1999) and	
	subsequently by Davidson and Richards (2005; 2006). The bed is small compared to most beds	
	known from Marlborough measuring 1.1 ha or approximately 130 m in length and up to 120 m.	
	Depths ranged from 11 m to 18.6 m. Comparable sea floor depths were located around the	
Piegoographicaroa	bed, however, the rhodoliths were not recorded anywhere outside a defined zone.	
Biogeographic area	Pelorus Sound	
Level of original information Date of original assessment	2. Qualitative internal report 1/09/2011	
Report	Davidson R. J.; Duffy C.A.J.; Gaze P.; Baxter, A.; DuFresne S.; Courtney S.; Hamill P. 2011.	
incport.	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)		1
Date	25/1/2018	1
Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental	
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Laura Richards, Courtney Rayes, Tom Scott-Simmonds	
Site Characteristics		
Original area of significant site (ha)	1.9	
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	1.1	
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m)	11 - 18.6	
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)	T	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Fine sand	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Silt	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Shell hash	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		1
Important species (revised site)		
Are important species present?	Yes	
Important species 1	Rhodolith bed	
Species status	Biogenic habitat forming	
Biogenic type (if applicable)	Rhodoliths	1
Human Impacts	None	1
Damage and or impacts noted	None	
Proportion of significant site effected Level of damage		
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 SUMMARY	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Original area of significant site (ha)		
	1.9	1.9
Recommended area of significant site (ha)	1.9 1.1	1.9 1.1
Change to original site	1.1 Decrease	1.1 Decrease
Change to original site Change (ha)		19 11 Decrease 0.8
Change to original site	1.1 Decrease	1.1 Decrease
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%)	1.1 Decrease 0.8	1.1 Decrease 0.8
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance	1.1 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high	1.1 Decresse 0.8 Moderate-high
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity	1.1 Decrease 0.8	1.1 Decrease 0.8
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance	1.1 Decreasion 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive	1.1 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity	1.1 Decreasion 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive	1.1 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review)
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness	1.1 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high)	1.1 Decresse 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high)
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity	1.1 becrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium)	1.1 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high)
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity	1.1 Becrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium)	11 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) M (medium)
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness	1.1 becrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high)	1.1 Decresse 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium)
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size	1.1 becrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low)	1.1 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium)
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habits tensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity	1.1 Betrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low)	11 Detresse 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L(low)
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size	1.1 becrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low)	1.1 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium)
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	1.1 becrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low)	1.1 Decresse 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low)
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	1.1 Becrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) E (low) E (low)	1.1 Decrease
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Ranity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	1.1 Betrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low)	11 Detrease
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	1.1 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low)	1.1 Decrease
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habita tesnitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	1.1 Becrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) H (high) U (low) L (low) D (low) L (low)	11 Detrease
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habita tensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments Recommendations	1.1 Betrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low)	1.1 Decrease
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habita tensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments Recommendations	1.1 Becrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) Beduced area due to improved survey resolution. A small site but it supports good quality rhodoliths. Forestry plantation located in adjacent catchment represents a potential threat from sedimentation. Modify boundary. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Davidson, R.J. and Richards, L.A. 2006: Biological report for an off-site marine farm (U 465, site B180) located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for LM. Govidin, S. Jr. Richards, L.A. 2005: Biological report on a proposed marine farm renewal	11 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) C (low) Extreme the state of the sta
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habita tensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments Recommendations	1.1 Betrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) Beduced area due to improved survey resolution. A small site but it supports good quality rhodoliths. Forestry plantation located in adjacent catchment represents a potential threat from sedimentation. Modify boundary. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Davidson, R.J. and Richards, LA. 2006: Biological report for an off-site marine farm (Li 465, site 8130) located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for L.M. Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 542. Davidson, R.J., Richards, LA. 2005: Biological report on a propsed marine farm renewal (U991708, Li 465) located in Picine Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental	11 Detresse 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Extremely a stationally rare, threatened and vulnerable habitat (Nelson, 2005; Nelson et al., 2012). One of two known rhodolith beds in the biogeographic area. Largest bed in biogeographic area. Iow connectivity as rhodoliths are sterifle and increase in size by vegetative growth. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Accept boundary adjustment. Protect from all physical disturbance. Nelson WA 2009. Calcified macroalgae - critical to coastal ecosystemsand vulnerable to change: A review. Mar Freshwat Res 60:787–801 Neill, K.; Nelson, W.; D'Archino, R. Leduc, D.; & Farr, T. 2014. Northern New Zealand rhodoliths: assessing faunal and floral diversity in physically contrasting beds. Marine Biodiversity, 45, 63-75.
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habita tensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments Recommendations	1.1 Betrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) Beduced area due to improved survey resolution. A small site but it supports good quality rhodoliths. Forestry plantation located in adjacent catchment represents a potential threat from sedimentation. Modify boundary. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Davidson, R.J. and Richards, LA. 2006: Biological report for an off-site marine farm (Li 465, site 8180) located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for LM. Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 542. Davidson, R.J., Richards, LA. 2005: Biological report on a proposed marine farm renewal (U991786, Li 465) located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for LM Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 475.	11 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) C (low) Extreme the state of the sta
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habita tensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments Recommendations	1.1 Betrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) Beduced area due to improved survey resolution. A small site but it supports good quality rhodoliths. Forestry plantation located in adjacent catchment represents a potential threat from sedimentation. Modify boundary. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Davidson, R.J. and Richards, LA. 2006: Biological report for an off-site marine farm (Li 465, site 8130) located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for L.M. Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 542. Davidson, R.J., Richards, LA. 2005: Biological report on a propsed marine farm renewal (U991708, Li 465) located in Picine Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental	11 Detresse 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Extremely a stationally rare, threatened and vulnerable habitat (Nelson, 2005; Nelson et al., 2012). One of two known rhodolith beds in the biogeographic area. Largest bed in biogeographic area. Iow connectivity as rhodoliths are sterifle and increase in size by vegetative growth. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Accept boundary adjustment. Protect from all physical disturbance. Nelson WA 2009. Calcified macroalgae - critical to coastal ecosystemsand vulnerable to change: A review. Mar Freshwat Res 60:787–801 Neill, K.; Nelson, W.; D'Archino, R. Leduc, D.; & Farr, T. 2014. Northern New Zealand rhodoliths: assessing faunal and floral diversity in physically contrasting beds. Marine Biodiversity, 45, 63-75.
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habita tensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments Recommendations	1.1 Becrease 0.8 Noderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low	11 Detresse 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) Extremely a stationally rare, threatened and vulnerable habitat (Nelson, 2005; Nelson et al., 2012). One of two known rhodolith beds in the biogeographic area. Largest bed in biogeographic area. Iow connectivity as rhodoliths are sterifle and increase in size by vegetative growth. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Accept boundary adjustment. Protect from all physical disturbance. Nelson WA 2009. Calcified macroalgae - critical to coastal ecosystemsand vulnerable to change: A review. Mar Freshwat Res 60:787–801 Neill, K.; Nelson, W.; D'Archino, R. Leduc, D.; & Farr, T. 2014. Northern New Zealand rhodoliths: assessing faunal and floral diversity in physically contrasting beds. Marine Biodiversity, 45, 63-75.
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments Recommendations	1.1 Becrease 0.8 Noderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) Reduced area due to improved survey resolution. A small site but it supports good quality modoliths. Forestry plantation located in adjacent catchment represents a potential threat from sedimentation. Modify boundary. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Davidson, R.J. and Richards, L.A. 2006: Biological report on a proposed marine farm (Li 465, site 8180) located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for LM Godiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 542. Davidson, R.J. 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm renewal (US91786, Li 465) located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for LM Godiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 475. Davidson, R.J. 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm renewal (US91786, Li 465) located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for LM Godiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 475. Davidson, R.J. 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm extension located est of Picnic Bay, Tawhitinui Reach, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltdin Survey and Monitoring Report No. 299.	11 Detresse 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) C (low) R hodolith beds are a nationally rare, threatened and vulnerable habitat (Nelson, 2009; Nelson et al., 2012). One of two known rhodolith beds in the biogeographic area. Largest bed in biogeographic area. low connectivity as rhodoliths are sterifie and increase in size by vegetative growth. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Accept boundary adjustment. Protect from all physical disturbance. Nelson WA 2009. Calcified macroalgae - critical to coastal ecosystemsand vulnerable to change: A review. Mar Freshwat Res 60:787–801 Neill, K.; Nelson, W.; D'Archino, R. Leduc, D.; & Farr, T. 2014. Northern New Zealand rhodoliths: assessing faunal and floral diversity in physically contrasting beds. Marine Biodiversity, 45. 63-75.
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments Recommendations	1.1 Betrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) Beduced area due to improved survey resolution. A small site but it supports good quality modoliths. Forestry plantation located in adjacent atchment represents a potential threat from sedimentation. Modify boundary. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Davidson, R.J. and Richards, L.A. 2006: Biological report for an off-site marine farm (Li 465, site 8180) located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for L.M. Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 542. Davidson, R.J., Richards, L.A. 2005: Biological report no a proposed marine farm renewal (U991786, Li 465) located in Pincie Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for LM Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 475. Davidson, R.J. 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm extension located east of Picnic Bay, Tawithituin Resch, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for LM Godsiff. Survey and Honitoring Report No. 475.	11 Detresse 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) C (low) R hodolith beds are a nationally rare, threatened and vulnerable habitat (Nelson, 2009; Nelson et al., 2012). One of two known rhodolith beds in the biogeographic area. Largest bed in biogeographic area. low connectivity as rhodoliths are sterifie and increase in size by vegetative growth. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Accept boundary adjustment. Protect from all physical disturbance. Nelson WA 2009. Calcified macroalgae - critical to coastal ecosystemsand vulnerable to change: A review. Mar Freshwat Res 60:787–801 Neill, K.; Nelson, W.; D'Archino, R. Leduc, D.; & Farr, T. 2014. Northern New Zealand rhodoliths: assessing faunal and floral diversity in physically contrasting beds. Marine Biodiversity, 45. 63-75.
Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments Recommendations	1.1 Betrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) Modify boundary. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Davidson R.J. R (hchrds, L.A. 2006: Biological report on a proposed marine farm renewal (U) 921/86, L (465) located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for L M Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 475. Davidson, R.J. Richard, L.A. 2005: Biological report on a proposed marine farm renewal (Li 997) Biological report on a proposed marine farm renewal L (Distributed on Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for L M Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 475. Davidson, R.J. Neil, K., Farr, T., Barr, N.D' Archinoj, Miler, S.; Stewart, R. 2012. Rhodolith Beds	11 Detresse 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) E (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) C (low) E (low) L (low
hange to original site hange (ha) erecentage change from original area (%) inthropogenic disturbance pecies/habitat sensitivity inthropogenic vulnerability ussessment criteria scores Representativeness Rafity Diversity Distinctiveness Size Connectivity Catchment Comments	1.1 Betrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) Beduced area due to improved survey resolution. A small site but it supports good quality rhodoliths. Forestry plantation located in adjacent atchment represents a potential threat from sedimentation. Modify boundary. Log loading site in this bay represents a threat. Davidson, R.J. and Richards, LA. 2006: Biological report for an off-site marine farm (Li 465, site 8180) located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for LM. Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 542. Davidson, R.J., Richards, LA. 2005: Biological report on a proposed marine farm renewal (U9917)86, L450 located in Picnic Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for LM Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 475. Davidson, R.J. 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm extension located east of Picnic Bay, Tawithuini Resch, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd for LM Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 475. Davidson, R.J. 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm extension located east of Picnic Bay, Tawithuini Resch, Polorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for L.M. Godsiff. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 299. Nelson, W.A.; Neil, K.; Farr, T.; Barr, N.; O'Archine; Miller, S.; Stewart, R. 2012. Rhodolith Beds in Northern New Zealand: Characterisation of Associated Biodiversity and Vulnerability to	1.1 Decrease 0.8 Moderate-high Extremely sensitive Moderate Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) C (low) C (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) C (low) C (low) C (low) C (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) M (mediation) M (mediation)

# Site 3.8 Fitzroy Bay (elephantfish spawning)

Site number 3.8.8 Site name 3.8.8 Site aname 7.17 Site description of attributes 7.17 Biogeographic area 7.2 Bioge	zroy elephanfish spawning zroy alephanfish spawning ach inducing Hallam Cove, Garne, Savill and Canoe Bays, are situated at the western end of Tawhitinui ach. The Garne and Savill Bay Scenic Reserves cover much of the catchment of these bays. e shallow edges of these bays are used as spawning grounds by elephantfish. This is one of two regularly used	Expert panel assessment 3.8 Elephantfish lay large leathery egg cases, containing a single egg, on the seabed during springsummer, and the young elephantfish hatch 5.10 months later (Waite 1909, Graham 1956, Gorman 1953). Elephantfish lay their egg in many parts of the Markbrough Sounds, on sand or mud in 6.20 m of water (McClatchie & Lester 1994, Didler et al. 1998). Other known egg laying sites are Pegasus Bay, Wellington Harbour, Canterbury Bight, and inshore Otago waters including Blueskin Bay (Waite 1909, Graham 1956, Jones & Hadfield 1985).
Site name Fritz Site description of attributes Fritz Rea Ecological description of attributes The Biogeographic area Pelo Level of original information 2, 0, Date of original assessment CD// Report Biogeographic area Information 2, 0, Date of original assessment CD// Report Biogeographic area Information 2, 0, Date of original assessment CD// Biogeographic area Information 2, 0, Date of original assessment CD// Biogeographic area Information 2, 0, Date of original assessment CD// Biogeographic area Information 2, 0, Date of original area of Information 2, 0, Date of Original area of Significant Site (ha) 252,	zroy elephantfish spawning zroy elephantfish spawning zroy Bay complex, including Hallam Cove, Garne, Savill and Canoe Bays, are situated at the western end of Tawhitinui adh. The Garne and Savill Bay Scenic Reserves cover much of the catchment of these bays. e shallow edges of these bays are used as spawning grounds by elephantfish. This is one of two regularly used awning areas in the Marlborough Sounds, the other site is in inner Queen Charlotte Sound (Davidson <i>et al.</i> , 2011). kiorus Sound Qualitative internal report (20/2011) vidson R. J.; Oldy C.A.J.; Gaze P.; Baxter, A.; DuFresne S.; Courtney S.; Hamill P. 2011. Ecologically significant marine es in Marlborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson environmental limited for Marlborough District Council d Department of Conservation.	Elephantfish lay large leathery egg cases, containing a single egg, on the seabed during springsummer, and the young elephantfish hatch 5-10 monthis later (Walte 1909, Graham 1956, Gorman 1953, Elephantfish Juthier eggs in many parts of the Marborough Sounds, on sand or mud in 6-20 m of water (McClatchie & Lester 1994, Didier et al. 1998). Other known egg laying sites are Pegasus Bay, Wellington Harbour, Canterboury Bight, and inshore Otago wates in cuinding Blueskin Bay (Walte 1909, Graham
Ecological description of attributes The span Biogeographic area Pele Level of original information 2. c. Date of original assessment 00// Report Date Lead organisation Part 144 Lead organisation Dave Personnel Rob Site Characteristics Original area of significant site (ha) 252	e shallow edges of these bays are used as spawning grounds by elephantfish. This is one of two regularly used awning areas in the Marlborough Sounds, the other site is in inner Queen Charlotte Sound (Davidson <i>et al.</i> , 2011). Norus Sound Qualitative internal report ( <i>R0</i> /2011 widson R.1, 2014fy C.A.1, Gaze P.; Baxter, A.; DuFresne S.; Courtney S.; Hamill P. 2011. Ecologically significant marine es in Marlborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson environmental limited for Marlborough District Council d Department of Conservation.	and the young elephantfish hatch 5-10 months later (Waite 1909, Graham 1956, Gorman 1963). Elephantfish lay their eggs in many parts of the Marhborough Sounds, on sand or mud in 6-20 m of water (McClatchie & Lester 1994, Didier et al. 1998). Other known egg laying sites are Pegasus Bay, Wellington Harbour, Canterbury Bight, and inshore Otago waters including Blueskin Bay (Waite 1909, Graham
spa Biogeographic area Pelo Level of original information 2. 0. Date of original assessment 01// Report Dave and Teled work (present) Date Lead organisation Dav Personnel Rob Site Characteristics Original area of significant site (ha) 252.	awning areas in the Marlborough Sounds, the other site is in inner Queen Charlotte Sound (Davidson <i>et al.</i> , 2011). Jorus Sound Qualitative internal report (30/2011 vision R. J.; Oldyf C.A. J.; Gaze P.; Baxter, A.; DuFresne S.; Courtney S.; Hamill P. 2011. Ecologically significant marine es in Marlborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson environmental limited for Marlborough District Council d Department of Conservation.	and the young elephantifsh hatch 5-10 months later (Waite 1909, Graham 1956, Gorman 1953). Elephantifsh lay their eggs in many parts of the Marlborough Sounds, on sand or mud in 6-20 m of water (McClatchie & Lester 1994, Didier et al. 1998). Other known egg laying sites are Pegasus Bay, Wellington Harbour, Canterbury Bight, and inshore Otago waters including Blueskin Bay (Waite 1909, Graham
Level of original information 2 c.0. Date of original assessment 01// Report 02// Field work (present) 02// Date 02// Date 02// Lead organisation 02// Personnel 80// Site Characteristics 02// Original area of significant site (ha) 252.	Qualitative internal report (9/2011 vision R. J.; Duffy C.A.J.; Gaze P.; Baxter, A.; DuFresne S.; Courtney S.; Hamill P. 2011. Ecologically significant marine es in Marlborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson environmental limited for Marlborough District Council d Department of Conservation.	
Level of original information 2 c.0 Date of original assessment 01// Report Dav Site Charge of the sessment 02// Dave 148 Lead organisation 02// Personnel 800 Site Characteristics 02// Original area of significant site (ha) 252	Qualitative internal report (9/2011 vision R. J.; Duffy C.A.J.; Gaze P.; Baxter, A.; DuFresne S.; Courtney S.; Hamill P. 2011. Ecologically significant marine es in Marlborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson environmental limited for Marlborough District Council d Department of Conservation.	
Date of original assessment 01// Report Dave Dave Dave Dave Dave Dave Dave Dave	/09/2011 vidson R. July C. A. J.; Gaze P.; Baxter, A.; DuFresne S.; Courtney S.; Hamill P. 2011. Ecologically significant marine es in Marlborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson environmental limited for Marlborough District Council d Department of Conservation.	
site and and Field work (present) Date Lad organisation Dav Personnel Rob Site Characteristics Site characteristics (ba) 252	es in Marlborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson environmental limited for Marlborough District Council d Department of Conservation.	
Field work (present)         J48           Date         148           Lead organisation         Dave           Personnel         Rob           Site Characteristics         Original area of significant site (ha)         252	d Department of Conservation.	
Date 14 8 Lead organisation Dav Personnel Rob Site Characteristics Original area of significant site (ha) 252	& 15 February 2018	
Lead organisation Dav Personnel Rob Site Characteristics Original area of significant site (ha) 252		1
Site Characteristics Original area of significant site (ha) 252	ividson Environmental	
Original area of significant site (ha) 252	b Davidson, Laura Richards, Courtney Rayes, Tom Scott-Simmonds	
Marine zone Sub	blittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
	20 m eltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
Methods Method of assessment Dro	op camera (cable remote)	- 1
HD	photographs (remote underwater)	
Substratum (revised site)	) video (remote underwater)	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover) Silt	t	
	ad whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%) Dea	ad broken shell anule	
Substrata (localised patch or patches) She	ell hash	
Substrata (localised patch or patches) Important species (revised site)		J
Are important species present? Yes	s ephantfish spawning	
Species status Con	Inservation/scientific importance	
Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Exo	otic species. Asperococcus bullosus covered much of the benthos is Garne and Savill Bays. Unkown impact on	
spa: spa:	awning but may deter spawning. Introduced tubeworms common around coastal edges. Unknown impact on awning. Fine sediment appeared more apparent in Garne and Savill Bays. Aquaculture has impacted spawning bitat at a small number of sites.	
Level of impact Exo	-25% otcaigae has had a high level of impact at Garne and Savill Bays. Aquaculture impact at particular sites is high (i.e. der backbones). Sedimentation levels appear higher in Garne and Savill Bays (R Davidson pers. obs.).	
	troduced or exotic species dimentation	
	unaculture	
	isting and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Original area of significant site (ha) 252	2.6	252.6
Recommended area of significant site (ha) 160. Change to original site Des	crease	160.4 Decrease
Change (ha) 92.2 Percentage change from original area (%) 36.5	.2 .5%	92.2 36.5%
Anthropogenic disturbance Moo	oderate-high	
Species/habitat sensitivity Unk		
Anthropogenic vulnerability Moo	ıknown derate-high	
Assessment criteria scores Asse	oderate-high sessment criteria scores (original)	Assessment criteria scores (present review)
Assessment criteria scores Asse 1. Representativeness H (h	oderate-high sessment criteria scores (original) high)	Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium)
Assessment criteria scores Ass 1. Representativeness H (fr 2. Rarity M (r 3. Diversity L (l(	oderate-high sessment criteria scores (original) (high) (medium) iow)	H (high) M (medium) L (low)
Assessment criteria scores Ass 1. Representativeness H (h 2. Barity M (i 3. Oversity L (ic 4. Districtiveness M (i 5. Size L (ic	oderate-high sessment criteria scores (original) (high) (medium) (ow) (ow)	H (high) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) H (high)
Assessment criteria scores         Ass           1. Representativeness         H (h           2. Ranty         M (i)           3. Diversity         L (i)           4. Districtiveness         M (i)           5. Size         L (i)           6. Connectivity         M (i)           7. Catchment         H (i)	oderate-high sessment criteria scores (original) (high) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (medium) (medium)	H (high) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) H (high) M (medium)
Assessment criteria scores Ass 1. Representativeness H (fr 2. Ranty M (fr 4. Districtiveness M ( 4. Districtiveness M ( 6. Connectivity M (fr Comments Red and at s at s 1. Representation of the state of	derate-high sessment criteria scores (original) (high) (nesium) (new) (nesium) (ow) (nesium)	H (high) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) H (high) M (medium)
Assessment criteria scores Ass 1. Representativeness H (f) 3. Diversity L (f) 4. Distinctiveness M (f) 6. Connectivity M (f) 6. Connectivity M (f) Comments Red and ass approximation of the state of the st	oderate-high  sessment criteria scores (original) (high) (medium) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow	H (high) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) The review group recognise low numbers of egg cases were recorded during the present survey. It is unknown whether this is an abnormal event. A brief quantitative survey of Game Bay in the subsequent years would provide
Assessment criteria scores Ass 1. Representativeness H (h 2. Rarity M (i 4. Districtiveness M (i 6. Connectivity M (i 6. Connectivity M (i 7. Catchment H (i) Comments Red add add af ass add af ass add add af ass add add add add add add add	oderate-high  sessment criteria scores (original) (high) (medium) (ow) (ow) (medium) (ow) (medium) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow	H (high) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) H (high) The review group recognise low numbers of egg cases were recorded during the present survey. It is unknown whether this is an abnormal event. A brief quantitative survey of Game Bay in the subsequent years would provide
Assessment criteria scores  1. Representativeness  1. Representativeness  1. Representativeness  1. Representativeness  1. (It Comments  1. Catchment  Comments  1. Catchment  1. Comments	derate-high sessment criteria scores (original) (high) (medium) (low) (medium) (low) (medium) (low) (medium) (low) (medium) (medium) (low) (low) (medium) (low)	H (high) ((medium) (L(low) M(medium) H (high) M(medium) H (high) The review group recognize low numbers of egg cases were recorded during the present survey. It is unknown whether this is an abnormal event. A brief quantitative survey of Game Bay in the subsequent years would provide useful data. Hurst, R.J.; Stevenson, M.L.; Bagley, N.W.; Griggs, L.H.; Morrison, M.A.; Francis, M.P. 2000. Areas of importance for spavning, pupping or egg-laying, and juveniles of New Zealand costal fish. NIWA Technical Report. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project EVINP903 Objective 1.
Assessment criteria scores Ass 1. Representativeness H ( 2. Rarity M ( 3. Oversity L () ( 4. Districtiveness M ( 6. Connectivity M () ( Comments Representation () () () () () () () () () () () () ()	derate-high sessment criteria scores (original) (high) (medium) (ow) (medium) (ow) (medium) (ow) (medium) (ow) (medium) (medium) (ow) (medium) (medium) (ow) (ow) (medium) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow) (ow	H (high) (Incelum) (Ilow) M (medium) H(high) M (medium) H(high) The review group recognise low numbers of egg cases were recorded during the present survey. It is unknown whether this is an abnormal event. A brief quantitative survey of Game Bay in the subsequent years would provide useful data. 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
Assessment criteria scores  1. Representativeness  2. Aanty 3. Oversity 4. Districtiveness 4. Oversity 4. Districtiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment 6. Comments 7. Catchment 7.	derate-high sessment criteria scores (original) (high) (medium) (ow) (medium) (ow) (medium) (ow) (medium) (ow) (medium)	H (high) (M(medium) (JOw) (M(medium) H(high) M(medium) H(high) The review group recognise low numbers of egg cases were recorded during the present survey. It is unknown whether this is an abnormal event. A brief quantitative survey of Game Bay in the subsequent years would provide useful data. Hurst, R.J.; Stevenson, M.L.; Bagley, N.W.; Griggs, L.H.; Morrison, M.A.; Francis, M.P. 2000. Areas of importance for sparving, pupping or egg Javing, and Juveniles of New Zealand coastal fish. NIWA Technical Report. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project EV1999/30 Objective 1. Daffy, C.; Francis, M.; Dunn, M.; Finuczi, B.; Ford, R.; Hitchmough, R.; Rolfe, J. 2016. Conservation status of New Zealand chordincthrysn (chinares, sharks and rays), 2016. New Zealand Threat Classification Series. Department of

# Site 3.9 Tennyson Inlet (stable catchment)

Site Registration Detail (original) Site number	Existing and present survey information 3.27 SURVEY INCOMPLETE	Expert panel assessment 3.27
Site name	Tennyson Inlet	
Site description	Tennyson inlet is located at the western end of Tawhitinui Reach, 22 km north of Havelock. It has a main reach with many	
	small bays including Tawa, Tuna, Deep and Matai Bays (Godsiff Bay). The Inlet is well separated from the rest of the Sound due to its geographic location, as a result water residency time are likely to be some of the longest in the Sounds. There is	
	a relatively low variety of subtidal habitats and species compared to other areas in the Marlborough Sounds (Davidson <i>et</i>	
	al., 2011).	
Ecological description of attributes	Tennyson Inlet is recognised as the largest bay complex in the Marlborough Sounds surrounded by stable and protected native forest catchments (Davidson et al., 2011).	
	native forest tatchments (bavioson et 01., 2011).	
Biogeographic area	Pelorus Sound	
Level of original information Date of original assessment	2. Qualitative internal report 01/09/2011	
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	
Field work (present)	Department of Conservation.	
Date	17-18 March 2018	1
Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental	
Personnel Site Characteristics	Rob Davidson, Courtney Rayes, Tom Scott-Simmonds	
Original area of significant site (ha)	1211.68	1
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	1354.8 (preliminary)	
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m) Wave Climate	3-25 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) Sonar Scan	
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)	Fine sand	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Silt	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover) Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Bedrock	
Substrata (localised patch or patches) Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Boulder Cobble	
Important species (revised site)	course	1
Are important species present?	Yes	]
Important species 1	Elephantfish egg cases present	
Species status Human Impacts	Conservation/scientific importance	
Damage and or impacts noted	Exotic species. Asperococcus bullosus was observed in Ngawhakawhiti Bay. Introduced tubeworms (Chaetopterus)	]
	common an some locations around coastal edges.	
Proportion of significant site effected	< 10%	
Level of impact	< 10% Patchy	
	< 10%	
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	< 10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation	
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Introduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> <li>Existing and present survey information</li> </ul>	Expert panel assessment
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	< 10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation	Expert panel assessment 1211.68 1345.9
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed 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	<ul> <li>c 10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Introduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information           1211.68           1345.9           Increase	1211.68 1345.9 Increase
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha)	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Introduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information           1211.08           1345.9           Increase           124.2	1211.68
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed 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 (%)	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Introduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information           1211.08           1345.9           Intraste           134.2           11.3%	1211.68 1245.9 norcease 124.2
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed 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	10% Pathy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation  Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1345.9 Increase I342 1342 Low Low	1211.68 1345 9 norcease 134.2
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed 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 (%)	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Introduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information           1211.08           1345.9           Intraste           134.2           11.3%	1211.68 1245.9 norcease 124.2
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to riginal site Change change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Introduced or exotic species</li> <li>sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1245.9 Increase 134.2 11.1% Low Sensitive Low-moderate	1211 68 1345 9 Inforese 1342 11.1%
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende darea of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic usinerability Assessment criteria scores	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy introduced or exotic species Sedimentation</li> <li>Existing and present survey information 1211.08 134.9 Increase 134.2 1.1.% Increase Idd 2 I.1.% Increase Idd 2 I.1.%</li></ul>	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 134 2 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende darea of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Introduced or exotic species</li> <li>sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1245.9 Increase 134.2 11.1% Low Sensitive Low-moderate	1211 68 1345 9 Inforese 1342 11.1%
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unlerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity	c 10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1211.68 134.59 Increase 134.2 134.2 11.1% Cow Sensitive Low-moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) L (low)	1211 68 1345 9 Increase 134.2 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L (low) L (low)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitas sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness	c 10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1211.08 1241.08 1345.09 Increase 134.2 11.1% Low Sensitive Low-moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low)	1211 68 1345 9 increase 1342 134.2 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitate sensitivity Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitate sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment officiera acones 1. Representativeness 2. Ranty 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity	c 10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1211.08 1245.9 1345.9 1342 1342 11.1% Low Sensitive Low-moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high)	1211 68 1345 9 increase 124.2 121.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H (high) H (high)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	c 10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1211.68 134.59 134.59 134.2 134.2 134.2 134.2 134.2 134.5 Low Sensitive Low-moderate Low-moderate Low-moderate Low H(high) L(low) L(lo	1211 68 1345 9 Instruction 1342 1343 1343 1343 1343 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) H (high)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitate sensitivity Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitate sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment officiera acones 1. Representativeness 2. Ranty 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity	c 10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species <u>sedimentation</u> Existing and present survey information           1211.68           1245.9           Increase           1342.9           1342.1           135.9           Sensitive           Low           Sensitive           Low-moderate           Assessment criteria scores (original)           H (high)           L(low)	1211 68 1345 9 increase 124.2 121.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H (high) H (high)
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation          Existing and present survey information         1211.68         1211.69         Increase         1345.9         Increase         1342         11.3%         Low         Sensitive         Low-moderate         Assessment criteria scores (original)         H (high)         L (low)         L	1111 68 1345 9 increase 134.2 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H(high) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1211.08 1211.08 134.2 134.2 134.2 11.3% Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Sessement criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) SURVEY TINCOMPLETE. New elephant(ish spaning area documented in Penzance Bay (see site 3.29). New site in Matai Bay (see site 3.29). Stotic algae Asperococcus bulisus (Netson and Knight, 1959) was present in Ngawhakawitit Bay. Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many.	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	EXPS Patchy introduced or exotic species Sedimentation          Existing and present survey information         1211.68         1211.69         Increase         1345.9         Increase         134.2         11.3%         Low         Sensitive         Low         Kinght         Kinght         Liow         Liow         Liow         Section accord case logitistic state	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Introduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> <li>Existing and present survey information</li> <li>1211.68</li> <li>1245.9</li> <li>Increase</li> <li>134.5.9</li> <li>Increase</li> <li>134.2</li> <li>11.3%</li> <li>Low</li> <li>Sensitive</li> <li>Low moderate</li> <li>Assessment criteria scores (original)</li> <li>H (high)</li> <li>L (low)</li> &lt;</ul>	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species <u>sedimentation</u> Existing and present survey information 1211.08 1211.08 134.2 134.5 134.5 134.2 134.7 14.10 10w Low-moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) U(low) H (high) SURVEY INCOMPLETE. New elephantfish spaning area documented in Penzance Bay (see site 3.29). New site in Matai Bay (see site 3.29). Locit calgue Asperococuto Bullosus (Nelson and Knight, 1995) was present in Ngawhakawhiti Bay. Exotic tubeworm (Chatopteridea) Bulloant at some locitorias round coastal edges. In New Zeiland there have been mary recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, Juage areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be C. variopedatus. Since about 1995, Juage areas of the about correct in parchment-like tubes in the about does do correct on parchment-like tubes into millions of market coast tubes into millions of and coast does do correct on parchment-like tubes into millions of market coast of the co	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Introduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information 1211.68 134.5.9 Introduced or exotic species 34.2 134.2 134.3 134.4 134.4 134.5 134.5 134.5 134.7 134.7 134.8 134.2 134.4 134.4 134.4 134.4 134.4 134.4 134.5 9 Introduced or exotic species 9 <p< td=""><td>1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H (high) H</td></p<>	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Introduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information 1211.68 134.5.9 Introduced or exotic species 34.2 134.2 134.2 134.3 134.4 134.5 10w Sensitive Low-moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) E (low) H (high) H (	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1211.68 134.5.9 Introduced or exotic species Sensitive 134.2 134.2 11.3% Low Sensitive Sensitive Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Sensitive Sensitive Sensitive Sensitive Sensitive Sensitive Sensitive Sensit	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	10% Patchy Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1211.68 134.5.9 Introduced or exotic species Sensitive 134.2 11.3% Low Sensitive Lifoxity It high H(high) Lifoxity Li	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	Existing and present survey information          Existing and present survey information         1211.68         1211.68         1345.9         Increase         1342         11.35         Low         Sensitive         Low-moderate         Sessement criteria scores (original)         H (high)         L (low)         Sessement criteria scores (original)         H (high)         L (low)         SURVEY INCOMPLETE. New elephantfish spaning area documented in Penzance Bay (see site 3.29). New site in Matal Bay (see site 3.23). Sotic algae Asperoccus bullosus (Nelson and Knight, 1995) was present in Ngawhakawhiti Bay. Exotic tubeworm (Chaetoperidea) abundmat as one locations around coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parthmeth-like tubes of Chaetopersent likening ufferstorms (Winkpedia, 2015). Since about 1995, Jarge areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be C - variopedatus. Since about 1995, Jarge areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the storms, these tubes break into millions of parchmet-like tubes. Chaetoper sealey, advingedia, 2015, Jarge areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be C - variopedatus. Since about 1995, divers report de sealey Moking, Harage bae	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1211.68 134.5.9 Increase 134.2 134.2 134.3 134.5.9 Increase 134.2 134.3 11.3% Low Sensitive Low <plow< p=""> Low <plow< p=""> Low Low<!--</td--><td>1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H (high) H</td></plow<></plow<>	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	Existing and present survey information          Existing and present survey information         1211.68         1211.68         1345.9         Increase         1342         11.35         Low         Sensitive         Low-moderate         Sessement criteria scores (original)         H (high)         L (low)         Sessement criteria scores (original)         H (high)         L (low)         SURVEY INCOMPLETE. New elephantfish spaning area documented in Penzance Bay (see site 3.29). New site in Matal Bay (see site 3.23). Sotic algae Asperoccus bullosus (Nelson and Knight, 1995) was present in Ngawhakawhiti Bay. Exotic tubeworm (Chaetoperidea) abundmat as one locations around coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parthmeth-like tubes of Chaetopersent likening ufferstorms (Winkpedia, 2015). Since about 1995, Jarge areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be C - variopedatus. Since about 1995, Jarge areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the storms, these tubes break into millions of parchmet-like tubes. Chaetoper sealey, advingedia, 2015, Jarge areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be C - variopedatus. Since about 1995, divers report de sealey Moking, Harage bae	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	10% Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1211.68 134.2 134.5.9 Increase 134.2 134.7 135.7 136.7	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	EXIST Patchy introduced or exotic species Sedimentation          Existing and present survey information         1211.68         1211.68         1345.9         Increase         1342.1         1345.9         Increase         1345.9         Increase         1345.9         Increase         1345.9         Increase         1345.9         Increase         1345.9         Increase         1346.1         Low         Sensitive         Low moderate         Assessment criteria scores (original)         H (high)         L (low)         L (low)         L (low)         L (low)         SubVEY INCOMPLETE. New elephantfish spaning area documented in Penzance Bay (see site 3.29). New site in Matai Bay (see site 3.28). Exotic algues Apprococcus bulsus (Helos and Knight, 1959) was present in Nganhawhiti Bay. Exotic tubeworn (Chaetopteride) alundant at some locations around coastal edges. In New Zeiland there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus litering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1959, July storms, term in the ganhabawhiti Bay. Exotic tubeworn (Chaetopterus). Since about 1959, July storms, term on the origon of substrate with both ends protruding bulking and in sate 199.90, and were colonised ba number of nativ eseaw	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unkerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5 Size 6. Connectivity 5. Catchment	EXIST Patchy introduced or exotic species Sedimentation          Existing and present survey information         1211.68         1211.68         1345.9         Increase         1342.1         1345.9         Increase         1345.9         Increase         1345.9         Increase         1345.9         Increase         1345.9         Increase         1345.9         Increase         1346.1         Low         Sensitive         Low moderate         Assessment criteria scores (original)         H (high)         L (low)         L (low)         L (low)         L (low)         SubVEY INCOMPLETE. New elephantfish spaning area documented in Penzance Bay (see site 3.29). New site in Matai Bay (see site 3.28). Exotic algues Apprococcus bulsus (Helos and Knight, 1959) was present in Nganhawhiti Bay. Exotic tubeworn (Chaetopteride) alundant at some locations around coastal edges. In New Zeiland there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus litering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1959, July storms, term in the ganhabawhiti Bay. Exotic tubeworn (Chaetopterus). Since about 1959, July storms, term on the origon of substrate with both ends protruding bulking and in sate 199.90, and were colonised ba number of nativ eseaw	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 1342 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H(high) H (high) H (h
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitas sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Size 6. Connectivity 3. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	10% Patchy Intoduced or exotic species Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1211.68 134.5.9 Intoduced or exotic species sedimentation 134.2 134.2 134.3 135.4 137.5 Low Sensitive Low moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) <td>1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H (high) H</td>	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 11.15 Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H (high) H
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habita sensitivity Assessment criteria sortes 1. Representativeness 2. Sarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Introduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information 1211.68 134.2 134.2 134.2 134.3 134.2 134.3 135.4 10w moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) E (low) Subscription (and the present survey information (and the present survey) Present or the present survey information (and the present survey) Subscription (and the present survey) Subscription (and the present survey) In (high) H (high) H (high) H (high) Different survey (and the present survey) Subscription (and the present	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 1342 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H(high) H (high) H (h
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitas sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Size 6. Connectivity 3. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	10% Patchy Intoduced or exotic species Sedimentation Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1211.68 134.5.9 Intoduced or exotic species sedimentation 134.2 134.2 134.3 135.4 137.5 Low Sensitive Low moderate Assessment criteria scores (original) H (high) L (low) <td>1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 1342 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H(high) H (high) H (h</td>	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 1342 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H(high) H (high) H (h
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitas sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Size 6. Connectivity 3. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Intoduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1211.63 134.5.9 Increase 134.2 11.3% Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Low Low Volume Low Line Low	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 1342 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H(high) H (high) H (h
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitas sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Size 6. Connectivity 3. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Intoduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1214.69 134.2 134.2 134.3 13.4 14.1 16.1 16.1 16.1 17.1 18.1 18.1 18.1 19.2 19.	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 1342 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H(high) H (high) H (h
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitas sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Size 6. Connectivity 3. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy Introduced or exotic species Sedimentation</li> <li>Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1345.9 Intrease 134.2 134.2 13.3 135.1 135.1 136.1</li></ul>	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 1342 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H(high) H (high) H (h
level of impact Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommende area of significant site (ha) Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitate sensitivity Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitate sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Sarte 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	<ul> <li>10%</li> <li>Patchy</li> <li>Intoduced or exotic species</li> <li>Sedimentation</li> </ul> Existing and present survey information 1211.68 1214.69 134.2 134.2 134.3 13.4 14.1 16.1 16.1 16.1 17.1 18.1 18.1 18.1 19.2 19.	1111 68 1345 9 Increase 1342 1342 11.1% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) H(high) H (high) H (h

# Site 311 Tapapa coast (current swept)

Site Registration Detail (original) Site number	Existing and present survey information 3.11	Expert panel assessment
Site name	Tapapa coast	3.11
Site description	This stretch of coast is located east of Maud Island at the eastern confluence of Waitata and Tawhitinui Reaches in the main	
	Pelorus Sound Channel. The existing Tapapa Point coastline site is approximately 1.4 km long. The subtidal sea floor shelves	
	steeply and is swept by moderate to strong tidal currents (Davidson et al., 2011).	
Ecological description of attributes	There is a wide variety of filter feeding organisms including biogenic habitat formers such as bryozoans, sponges, ascidians,	
	horse mussels and hydroids present at this site. Fish, particularly blue cod, are common and these communities also provide habitat for juvenile blue cod. This is one of the best examples of tidally swept habitats within the Pelorus biogeographic area	
	(Davidson et al., 2011).	
Biogeographic area	Pelorus Sound 2. Qualitative internal report	
Level of original information Date of original assessment	2. Qualitative internal report 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	25 January 2018	
Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental	
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Laura Richards, Courtney Rayes, Tom Scott-Simmonds	
Site Characteristics		
Original area of significant site (ha)	24.11	
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	13.03	
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m)	0-40 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)	
	Sonar Scan	
	Photographs (handheld surface)	
Substratum (revised site)	F	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Boulder Cobble	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Cobbie	
Substrata (wheespread and dominant >50% cover)	Fine sand	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Silt	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Bedrock	
Substrata (localised patch or patches) Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Important species (revised site) Are important species present?	Yes	
Important species 1	165	
Species status	Biogenic habitat forming	
Biogenic type (if applicable)	High relief biogenic (variety of species)	
Important species 2	Blue cod juveniles	
Species status	Iconic	
Biogenic type (if applicable)		
Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted	No impacts observed	
Proportion of significant site effected	No impacts observed	
Level of impact	Recreational fishing occurs mostly over the summer months. Anchoring occurs occasionally.	
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 SUMMARY	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Original area of significant site (ha)	24.11	24.11
Recommended area of significant site (ha)	13.03	13.03
Change to original site	Decrease	Decrease
Change (ha)	11.08	11.08
Percentage change from original area (%)	45.9%	45.9%
Anthropogenic disturbance	Low	
Species/habitat sensitivity	Sensitive	
Anthropogenic vulnerability	Low-moderate	
Assessment criteria scores	Assessment criteria scores (original)	Assessment criteria scores (present review)
1. Representativeness	M (medium)	H (high)
	L (low)	L (low)
2. Rarity 2. Diversity	U/biab)	
3. Diversity	H (high)	H (high) M (medium)
3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness	H (high) M (medium)	M (medium)
3. Diversity	H (high)	
3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	H (high) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium)	M (medium) H (high) H (high) NA
3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity	H (high) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) R educed area due to improved survey resolution. Biogenic communities present and abundant in some areas. Very high	M (medium) H (high) H (high) NA Ranked as best in current swept habitat in biogeographic area at present but should be reassessed when
3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	H (high) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) Reduced area due to improved survey resolution. Biogenic communities present and abundant in some areas. Very high numbers of blue cod present. Juvenile blue cod also regularly observed. One adult john dory observed. Some damage to	M (medium) H (high) H (high) NA Ranked as best in current swept habitat in biogeographic area at present but should be reassessed when Tawero Point or other sites in Pelorus are surveyed. This type of habitat on rocky substratum is likely to
3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	H (high) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) R educed area due to improved survey resolution. Biogenic communities present and abundant in some areas. Very high	M (medium) H (high) H (high) NA Ranked as best in current swept habitat in biogeographic area at present but should be reassessed when Tawero Point or other sites in Pelorus are surveyed. This type of habitat on rocky substratum is likely to be present along Waitata Reach coustlines exposed to currents. Largest site of its type of ar. High
3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	H (high) M (medium) L (low) L (low) M (medium) Reduced area due to improved survey resolution. Biogenic communities present and abundant in some areas. Very high numbers of blue cod present. Juvenile blue cod also regularly observed. One adult john dory observed. Some damage to	M (medium) H (high) H (high) NA Ranked as best in current swept habitat in biogeographic area at present but should be reassessed when Tawero Point or other sites in Pelorus are surveyed. This type of habitat on rocky substratum is likely to

# Site 3.12 Piripaua Reef

Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Site number	3.12	3.12
Site name	Piripaua reef	
Site description Ecological description of attributes	Piripaual is located at the northern end of Beatrix Bay.	
Ecological description of attributes	Davidson et al. (2011) stated this reef was one of the better examples of a reef system in central Pelorus Sound. The present survey confirms the presence of the reef and identifies the existence of more deep reef habitat than previously known.	
	commissible presence of the reer and identifies the existence of more deep reer natical than previously known.	
Biogeographic area	Pelorus Sound	
Level of original information	2. Qualitative 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	24 January 2018 Davidson Environmental	
Lead organisation Personnel	Rob Davidson, Laura Richards	
Site Characteristics		
Original area of significant site (ha)	0.685	
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	1.86	
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m)	1-33 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)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Bedrock	
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%)		
Substrata (minor <30%)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Boulder	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Cobble	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Shell hash	
Important species (revised site)	-	
Are important species present?	No	
Important species 1		
Species status Human Impacts	I	
Damage and or impacts noted	Mussel shell in proximity of reef	
Proportion of significant site effected		
Level of impact	Mussel droppers are located east and west of the reef. Mussel shell was observed in the nearby areas but not on the reef itself.	
Type of damage or activity observed	Aquaculture	
Type of damage or activity observed		
Type of damage or activity observed		
Type of damage of activity observed		
Type of damage or activity observed	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
	Existing and present survey information 0.685	Expert panel assessment 0.685
Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha)	0.685 1.86	
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	0.685 1.86 Increase	0.685 1.86 Increase
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)	0.685 1.86 Increase 1.17	0.685 1.86 Increase 1.17
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	0.685 1.86 Increase	0.685 1.86 Increase
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 (%)	0.685 1.86 Increase 1.17 160.0%	0.685 1.86 Increase 1.17
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)	0.685 1.86 Increase 1.17	0.685 1.86 Increase 1.17
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	0.685 1.86 1.07 1.17 160.0% Low	0.685 1.86 Increase 1.17
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 10.0% Low Sensitive Low	0.685 1.86 Inforease 1.17 160.0%
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 Species/habita sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original)	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review)
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  Species/habitat sensitivity  Anthropogenic vulnerability  Assessment criteria scores  . Representativeness	0.685 1.86 Increase 1.17 160.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) M(medium)	0.685 1.86 Increase 1.17 160.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium)
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 Species/habits tesnitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low)	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low)
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  Species/habitat sensitivity  Anthropogenic vulnerability  Assessment criteria scores  . Representativeness	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) M(medium) L(low) M(medium) L(low)	0.685 1.86 Increase 1.17 160.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M(medium) L(low) M(medium)
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low)	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low)
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability  Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 10.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) M (medium)	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low)
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability  Assessment criteria scores  1. Representativeness  2. Rarity  3. Diversity  4. Distinctiveness  5. Size  6. Connectivity  7. Catchment	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessmet criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) L (low) L (low)	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.17 160.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) L (low)
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  Species/habitat sensitivity  Anthropogenic disturbance  I Representativeness  I Raprity  Diversity  J Distinctiveness  Size  Connectivity	0.685 1.86 inforease 1.17 1.00% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) M(medium) L(low) M(medium) M(medium) M(medium) M(medium) M(medium) M(medium) M(medium)	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium)
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic disturbance I Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) L (low) I (low) I (low) I (low) I (low) I (low) I (low)	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.00.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) Two other significant reef sites located in Beatrix Bay area. Reef habitats and communities typical of central Pelorus rocky habitats.
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability  Assessment criteria scores  1. Representativeness  2. Rarity  3. Diversity  4. Distinctiveness  5. Size  6. Connectivity  7. Catchment	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) L (low) I (low) I (low) I (low) I (low) I (low) I (low)	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium)
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cathment Comments Recommendations	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) L (low) I (low) I (low) I (low) I (low) I (low) I (low)	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.00.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) Two other significant reef sites located in Beatrix Bay area. Reef habitats and communities typical of central Pelorus rocky habitats.
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic disturbance I Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.00% 1.00% Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low M(medium) L(low) M(medium) L(low) M(medium) M(medium) M(medium) Adopt new site boundaries. Ensure no marine farm growing structures are placed over the reef. Alcock, N; Handley, S. 2000. Proposed extension to marine farm licence 264 in Beatrix Bay, Pelorus Sound. NIWA dient report MXSU0423/4, Prepared for Sanford Limited.	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.00.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) Two other significant reef sites located in Beatrix Bay area. Reef habitats and communities typical of central Pelorus rocky habitats.
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cathment Comments Recommendations	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) L(low) L(l	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.00.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) Two other significant reef sites located in Beatrix Bay area. Reef habitats and communities typical of central Pelorus rocky habitats.
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cathment Comments Recommendations	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.00% 1.00% Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low M(medium) L(low) M(medium) L(low) M(medium) M(medium) M(medium) Adopt new site boundaries. Ensure no marine farm growing structures are placed over the reef. Alcock, N; Handley, S. 2000. Proposed extension to marine farm licence 264 in Beatrix Bay, Pelorus Sound. NIWA dient report MXSU0423/4, Prepared for Sanford Limited.	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.00.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) Two other significant reef sites located in Beatrix Bay area. Reef habitats and communities typical of central Pelorus rocky habitats.
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cathment Comments Recommendations	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% 1.0w Sensitive Low Sensitive Low M(medium) L(low) M(medium) L(low) M(medium) L(low) M(medium) L(low) L(	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.00.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) Two other significant reef sites located in Beatrix Bay area. Reef habitats and communities typical of central Pelorus rocky habitats.
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cathment Comments Recommendations	0.685 1.86 1.87 1.87 1.87 1.90.0% Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) M (medium) Adopt new site boundaries. Ensure no marine farm growing structures are placed over the reef. Alcock, N; Handley, S. 2000. Proposed extension to marine farm licence 264 in Beatrix Bay, Pelorus Sound. NIWA client report MUS00423/4, Prepared for Sanford Limited. Davidson, R, J. town, D. A. 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm extension in northem Beatrix Bay, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for Sanford (South Island ) Ltd and Southern Mussel Farms Ltd Survey and Monitoring Report No. 219. Davidson, R, J. 1996. Description of the subtidal macrobenthic substratum and associated communities from a proposed marine farm	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.00.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) Two other significant reef sites located in Beatrix Bay area. Reef habitats and communities typical of central Pelorus rocky habitats.
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cathment Comments Recommendations	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 160.0% 1.0w Sensitive Low Sensitive Low M(medium) L(low) M(medium) L(low) M(medium) L(low) M(medium) L(low) L(	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.00.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) Two other significant reef sites located in Beatrix Bay area. Reef habitats and communities typical of central Pelorus rocky habitats.
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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cathment Comments Recommendations	0685 1.86 increase 1.17 150.0% 1.0W Sensitive 1.0W Sensitive 1.0W M(medium) 1.(Iow) M(medium) 1.(Iow) M(medium) 1.(Iow) M(medium) 1.(Iow) M(medium) 1.(Iow) M(medium) 1.(Iow)	0.685 1.86 increase 1.17 1.00.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) Two other significant reef sites located in Beatrix Bay area. Reef habitats and communities typical of central Pelorus rocky habitats.

# Site 3.15 Grant Bay Reef

State state       1.2			-
Since of the second of the s	Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Backeria         Backeria         Backeria         Backeria         Backeria           Response for all margeria         Backeria <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
Image: Section of Section Secti			
Bandwission of a	Site description		
Notes of the second s		length extends from the small headland in this bay.	
Notes of the second s			
Image: Control of the Surger State of end of the Surger State of the Surger State of end of the Surger State of the Surger S	Ecological description of attributes		
Handward Note of a part of			
card or gammaConstrained or gammaBarry DataConstrained o	Disease much is sure		
Biol of gamma and ga	Biogeographic area		
indIndex of a call ship with a last of the intermediate last of observing and notification (intermediate last of observing and notserving and notserving and no			
Internet field with field with a set of the	Report		
bitControl (Control (Contro) (Control (Contro) (Contro) (Co		complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd. for Andrew King, Survey and Monitoring report no. 866.	
bitControl (Control (Contro) (Control (Contro) (Contro) (Co			
bitControl (Control (Contro) (Control (Contro) (Contro) (Co	Field work (mean at)		1
displayingBiolensine 		4 1-1-2017 24 1-2017	1
readingDescentionBiolonizationABiolonization			
Selected test and manual with a contract with a co			
Display and splay an		Rob Davidson, Laura Richards	
Register of the field of a construct dual of a loss of a construct dual of a lo			
Mate and beam an			
pick numberInterfact and the second sec	Suggested revision of significant site (ha)		
Wate DataDieterional water langeBieler onder lange manageBieler onder lange manageBiologe and solumes 2000, unequide antonioBieler onder langeBiologe antonio de langeBieler onder lange <t< td=""><td></td><td>Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)</td><td></td></t<>		Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Motion         Term           Status         Term           Status </td <td>Depth range (m)</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Depth range (m)		
Method sequenceMore an additional additio		Sheitered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
jorned price managementjorned price managementSubstrutt (metric default and some and s			
Subtractive diversion of the second s	Method of assessment		
Bioleta (windges and some and solve over)         Book           Bioleta (windges and some and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)           Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)           Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)           Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)           Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)           Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)           Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)           Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)           Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)           Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)           Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Bioleta (windges and solve over)           Bioleta (windges and solve over)         Biole		Drop camera (cable remote)	
Balance and examples of the source of the	Substratum (revised site)		
Balance and examples of the source of the	Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Bedrock	
biolated bi	Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
bisbust         Code (manual 30 SM) cover) Best SM cover) Best SM covers (manual 30 SM cover) Best SM cover SM cove			
Babasa (among 30 Sin over)         Pre and Mode Selfas (among 30 Sin over)         Pre and Mode Selfas (among 30 Sin over)           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dead Dealers all         Dead Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Deal Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           Subtras (among 30 Sin over)         Dealers all         Dealers all           S			
biskupse         Bake biskupse           biskupse         Bisk			
Backbard			
biolated biolate			
sidenta (localised path or paths)         second path or paths)           upport target of paths)	Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead broken shell	
bibbase         control           bibbase         <			
importspecies (revise):         Importspecies (revise):         Importspecies (revise):           importspecies (revise):         Importspecies (revise):         Importspecies (revise):           isgenic (revise):         Importspecies (revise):         Importspecies (revise):			
Am ingoing spears?         Indecember of transmission         Indecember of transmission           species studie         Indecember of transmission         <	Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Am ingoing spears?         Indecember of transmission         Indecember of transmission           species studie         Indecember of transmission         <	Important species (revised site)		
species fund species	Are important species present?	No	
Bigginst gift ingslicable)         Including inger statisty oper version of statisty oper	Important species 1		
Human pact Sorder Noportion of significative effected excel of damage or activity observed type of damage or activity observed         Eventse           SIGNEF CLANT SITE SUMMARY         Served Served Served type of damage or activity observed         Served Serve	Species status		
Human pact Sorder Noportion of significative effected excel of damage or activity observed type of damage or activity observed         Eventse           SIGNEF CLANT SITE SUMMARY         Served Served Served type of damage or activity observed         Served Serve	Biogenic type (if applicable)		
Damage and vimpacts noted hopportion of significant site effected type of damage or activity observed type of damage or activity observed type of damage or activity observed type of damage or activity observed         No           SIGN-FLAT SITE SUMMARY         bisling and present survey information         Dept sent assessment           SIGN-FLAT SITE SUMMARY         bisling and present survey information         Dept sent assessment           SIGN-FLAT SITE SUMMARY         bisling and present survey information         Dept sent assessment           SIGN-FLAT SITE SUMMARY         bisling and present survey information         Dept sent assessment           SIGN-FLAT SITE SUMMARY         bisling and present survey information         Dept sent assessment           Sign-Flat Si			
Proposition significant site referded use of adupt sovered type of dange or activity observed type of type of dange or activity obser		No	1
Lace of dange or skilvy blevered Ype of dange or skilvy blevered         Subscription           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered           Signer Scilvy blevered         Signer Scilvy blevered         Sign	Proportion of significant site effected		
Type of diange or activity observed         Subserved           Store of diange or activity observed         Second S	Level of damage		
Type of diange or activity observed         Subserved           Store of diange or activity observed         Second S	Type of damage or activity observed		
Page of damage or activity observed         Index of significant site (ha)         Side and present survey information         Sector survey           SIGN FICANT SITE SUMMARY         3507         3507         3507           Song and are of significant site (ha)         2527         3507         3507           Change to original site (ha)         252         252         3507           Change to original site (ha)         2533         1533         1533           Preventing change from original area (k)         1500%         1500%         1500%           Anthropogenic disturbance         None         Second change (ha)         1500%           Species/habitat seconses         Second change (ha)         1500%         1500%           Assessment citeria socres foresant review         Microelium         Microelium         1600%           Assessment citeria socres foresant review         Microelium         1600%         1600%         1600%         1600%         1600%         1600%         1600% <td< td=""><td>Type of damage or activity observed</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Type of damage or activity observed		
Significant Site SubMARY         bisting and present survey information         Expert panel assessment           Driginal area of significants the (ha) economendod area of significants the (ha)         0.957         0.957           Drage to reginal area of significants the (ha)         2.22         2.20           Drage to reginal area (S)         1.933         0.967           Drage to reginal area (S)         356.0%         356.0%           Sensitive         1.933         0.967           Undenability sensitive         Sensitive         0.967           Undenability sensitive         Sensitive         0.967           Low or         Sensitive         0.967           Low or         1.903         0.967           Assessment criteria scores (present review)         M (medium)         1.000           Low or         1.000         0.967           Sensitive         Lilow 0         0.967           Low or         1.000         0.967           Low or         1.000         0.967           Low or         1.000         0.967           Low or         0.967         M (medium)         1.0001           Low or         0.967         M (medium)         1.0001           Low or	Type of damage or activity observed		
Original area of significant site (ha)     0.987       Recommended and significant site (ha)     2.92       Change to original site     accesse       Recommended and significant site (ha)     1.933       1.933     1.933       Percentage change from original area (%)     160.0%       Anthropogenic disturbance     None       Species/habitat sensitivity     Sensitive       Undersatility     Sensitive       Juneability assessment     Low       Assessment criteria scores (original)     Assessment criteria scores (original)       Assessment criteria scores (original)     M (medium)       1. Representativeness     M (medium)       1. Representativeness     M (medium)       2. Starty     L (low)       3. Starte     M (medium)       1. Other scores     M (medium)       3. Starte     M (medium)       2. Starte     M (medium)       1. Other scores     M (medium)       3. Starte     M (medium)       3. Starte     M (medium)       4. Other scores     M (medium)       5. Starte     M (medium)       6. Connectivity     L (low)       Comments     One of the better scores score di niside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the reel from adjacent marine farm       Recommendations     Adjust boundaries to encompass reef	Type of damage or activity observed		
Original area of significant site (ha)     0.987       Recommended and significant site (ha)     2.92       Change to original site     accesse       Recommended and significant site (ha)     1.933       1.933     1.933       Percentage change from original area (%)     160.0%       Anthropogenic disturbance     None       Species/habitat sensitivity     Sensitive       Undersatility     Sensitive       Juneability assessment     Low       Assessment criteria scores (original)     Assessment criteria scores (original)       Assessment criteria scores (original)     M (medium)       1. Representativeness     M (medium)       1. Representativeness     M (medium)       2. Starty     L (low)       3. Starte     M (medium)       1. Other scores     M (medium)       3. Starte     M (medium)       2. Starte     M (medium)       1. Other scores     M (medium)       3. Starte     M (medium)       3. Starte     M (medium)       4. Other scores     M (medium)       5. Starte     M (medium)       6. Connectivity     L (low)       Comments     One of the better scores score di niside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the reel from adjacent marine farm       Recommendations     Adjust boundaries to encompass reef			
Recommended area of significant sig (ham)       222         Change to original sige       Insea         Change to original sige       1933         Change for original area (%)       1936         Solos       1937         Percentage change from original area (%)       None         Solos       None         Anthropogenic disturbance       None         Solos       Solos         Anthropogenic disturbance       None         Solos       Solos         Assessment citeria scores (original)       Assessment citeria scores (present review)         Assessment citeria scores (original original citeria scores (original citeria s	SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Change to viginal site         Increase           Change to viginal area (%)         193           Percentage change from original area (%)         196.0%           Anthropogenic disturbance         None           Species/habitat sensitivity         Sensitive           Underschild         Sensitive           Underschild         Sensitive           Underschild         Sensitive           Sensitive         Sensitive           Underschild         M(medium)           Assessment citeria scores (present eview)         M(medium)           Assessment (Mercian Scores (original)         Assessment (M(medium)           1. Representativeness         M(medium)         M(medium)           2. Diversity         M(medium)         M(medium)           3. Diversity         M(medium)         M(medium)           3. Size         M(medium)         M(medium)           6. Connectivity         L(low)         M(medium)           6. Connectivity         L(low)         M(medium)           6. Connectivity         Adopt adjusted boundaries to encompass reef structure.           Recommendations         Adopt adjusted boundaries.         Diversity Boundaries, L. A. 207. Biological report for ther exempting of ansite farm Botz (Horig, Report No. 344. Prepared by Davisons firm/commental Unint (Gr A. a	Original area of significant site (ha)		
Change (ha)       1933         Percentage change from original area (%)       196.0%         Anthropogenic disturbance       None         Species/habit test ensitivity       Sensitive         Low       Sensitive         Vulnerability assessment       Low         Assessment criteria scores (present review)       Assessment criteria scores (present review)         Assessment criteria scores (present review)       M(medium)         3. Diversity       M(medium)       M(medium)         3. Size S       M (medium)       M(medium)         5. Size S       M (medium)       L(low)         Connectivity       L(low)       L(low)         7. Catchment       L(low)       L(low)         Connectivity       Mutarise to encompass reef structure.       Adopt adjusted boundaries.         Representatives       Adjust boundaries to encompass reef structure.       Adopt adjusted boundaries.         Representatives       Monitoring Report No. 344, Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ling for A and S. King.       Puresental adjusted boundaries.         Recommendations       Ad	Recommended area of significant site (ha)	2.92	2.92
Percentage change from original area (%)     196.0%     196.0%       Anthropogenic disturbance     None     Sensitive       Sensitive     Sensitive     Sensitive       Undernability sessment     Assessment criteria scores (present review)     Assessment criteria scores (present review)       Assessment criteria scores     Assessment criteria scores (present review)     M(medium)       Assessment criteria scores     M(medium, Onto)     M(medium, Onto)       3. Diversity     M(medium, Onto)     M(medium, Onto)       3. Diversity     M(medium, Onto)     M(medium, Onto)       4. Constructive     M(medium, Onto)     M(medium, Onto)       5. Size     M(medium, Onto)     M(medium, Onto)       C. Connents     One of the better examples of a sheltered ree frinside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the ree from adjacent marine farm     Other significant creef sites known from Beatrix Bay area.       Recommendations     Adjusted boundaries to encompass reef structure.     Adjusted boundaries.       RetERENCES     Davidson, R.J. 2000. Additional information on apposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davison Environmental Link and King. Survey and monitoring report no. 384. Grant Bay, Relorus Sound.     Survey and monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davison Environmental Link and King. Survey and monitoring report no. 386. Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.     Survey and monitoring Report No. 384. Prepared by Davison Environmental Link and King. Sur	Change to original site	Increase	Increase
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habits sensitivity Vulnerability assessment Low Assessment criteria scores biox Assessment criteria scores (present review) Low Assessment criteria scores (present review) Low Assessment criteria scores (present review) M(medium) L (low) 1. Biopresentativeness L (low) 1. Biopresentativeness L (low) 1. Biotinctiveness M (medium) L (low) 3. Diversity M (medium) L (low) 3. Diversity M (medium) L (low) 3. Diversity M (medium) L (low) 5. Size S. Size S. Size S. Size M (medium) L (low) Contentive L (low) Catchment L (low) L (low)	Change (ha)		
Species/paties/species/paties/species/paties/species/paties/paties/species/paties/species/paties/species/paties/species/paties/paties/species/paties/paties/species/pati	Percentage change from original area (%)	196.0%	196.0%
Species/paties/species/paties/species/paties/species/paties/paties/species/paties/species/paties/species/paties/species/paties/paties/species/paties/paties/species/pati			
Numerability assessment         Low         Sessment criteria scores         Assessment criteria scores (present review)           Assessment criteria scores         Assessment criteria scores (present review)         M(medium)           Assessment criteria scores (present review)         M(medium)         M(medium)           3. Diversity         L(Dow)         L(Dow)         L(Dow)           3. Diversity         M(medium)         M(medium)         M(medium)           5. Size         M(medium)         L(Dow)         M(medium)           5. Size         M(medium)         M(medium)         M(medium)           7. Catchment         L(Dow)         M(medium)         L(Dow)           7. Catchments         One of the better examples of a sheltered reef inside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the reef from adjacent marine farm         Other significant reef sites known from Beatrix Bay area.           Recommendations         Adjusta boundaries to encompass reef structure.         Adopt adjusted boundaries.           RefERENCES         Avidson, R.J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay. Pelorus Sound. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Litter for Andrew King. Survey and monitoring report no. 846.         Adopt adjusted boundaries.           Bardidson, R. J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay. Pelorus Sound.         Survey and monitoring repo			
Assessment criteria scores (or space for space			
1. Beperantativeness     M (medium)     M (medium)       2. Bratry     L (dow)     L (dow)       3. Diversity     M (medium)     M (medium)       4. Distinctiveness     M (medium)     L (low)       5. Size     M (medium)     M (medium)       6. Connectivity     L (low)     M (medium)       7. Catchment     L (low)     M (medium)       6. Connectivity     De of the better examples of a shelter of er liside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the reef from adjacent marine farm     Other significant cert sites known from Beatrix Bay area.       Resonmendations     Adjust boundaries to encompass reef structure.     Adjust adjusted boundaries.       Respective     Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davidson Entry momental Lint Adjuster Aging Cora-Crail Bay.     Size Adjuster Bay. Cora-Crail Bay.       Complex. Prepared by Davidson Entry informantial Lint Andrew King. Survey and monitoring report no. 866.     Size Adjuster Bay. Flace, Survey and monitoring report no. 866.       Bardidson, R. J. J. D. R. Town 1999. Biological report no a proposed marine farm BS44. Grant Bay. Pelorus Sound.     Size Adjuster Bay. Edia Size Adjuster Bay.	vunierability assessment	LUW	
1. Beperantativeness     M (medium)     M (medium)       2. Bratry     L (dow)     L (dow)       3. Diversity     M (medium)     M (medium)       4. Distinctiveness     M (medium)     L (low)       5. Size     M (medium)     M (medium)       6. Connectivity     L (low)     M (medium)       7. Catchment     L (low)     M (medium)       6. Connectivity     De of the better examples of a shelter of er liside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the reef from adjacent marine farm     Other significant cert sites known from Beatrix Bay area.       Resonmendations     Adjust boundaries to encompass reef structure.     Adjust adjusted boundaries.       Respective     Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davidson Entry momental Lint Adjuster Aging Cora-Crail Bay.     Size Adjuster Bay. Cora-Crail Bay.       Complex. Prepared by Davidson Entry informantial Lint Andrew King. Survey and monitoring report no. 866.     Size Adjuster Bay. Flace, Survey and monitoring report no. 866.       Bardidson, R. J. J. D. R. Town 1999. Biological report no a proposed marine farm BS44. Grant Bay. Pelorus Sound.     Size Adjuster Bay. Edia Size Adjuster Bay.	Assessment eriteria searce	Assessment exiteria searce (ariginal)	Assessment extenie seaves (avecent review)
2. fairly     L(low)     L(low)       3. Diversity     M(medium)     M(medium)       3. Diversity     M(medium)     L(low)       5. Size     M(medium)     L(low)       5. Size     M(medium)     M(medium)       6. Connectivity     L(low)     M(medium)       7. Catchment     L(low)     M(medium)       Comments     One of the better examples of a sheltered reef inside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the reef from adjacent marine farms     Other significant reef sites known from Beatrix Bay area.       Recommendations     Adjust aboundaries to encompass reef structure.     Adopt adjusted boundaries.       ReFERENCES     Davidson, R.J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound. Survey and Monitoring Report NO. 344. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.       Davidson, R.J. 2000. R. Additional information on a proposed marine farm Bost4. Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay, Clova-Crail Bay, Complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.       Davidson, R. J. 2000. R. On 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm Bost4. Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay, Clova-Crail Bay, Clova-Crail Bay, Clova-Crail Bay, Clova-Crail Bay, Clova-Crail Bay, Clova-Scull       Davidson, R. J. 2000. Rom 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm for Clova-Crail Bay,			
3. Diversity     M (medium)     M (medium)       4. Distinctiveness     M (medium)     L (dow)       5. Size     M (medium)     M (medium)       5. Size     M (medium)     M (medium)       6. Connectivity     L (low)     M (medium)       Catchinert     L (low)     L (low)       Comments     One of the better examples of a sheltered ref inside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the reef from adjacent marine farm     Other significant cef sites known from Beatrix Bay area.       Recommendations     A diguta boundaries to encompass ref structure.     A diguta doundaries.       RetEFERENCES     Davidson, R.J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm (Set, Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 34A. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Linited for A. and S. King.     Set			
A. Distinctiveness     M (medium)     L (low)       S. Size     M (medium)     M (medium)       S. Size     M (medium)     M (medium)       C. Connectivity     L (low)     M (medium)       C. Connectivity     L (low)     L (low)       C. Connectivity     C (low)     L (low)       C. Connectivity     C (low)     L (low)       Connectivity     C (low)     L (low)       Connectivity     C (low)     C (low)       Connectivity     C (low)     C (low)       Connectivity     C (low)     C (low)       Recommendations     A dipt adjusted boundaries.       References     Davidson, R.J. 200. Additional information on a proposed marine farm locate west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.       Davidson, R.J. 20. Additional information on a proposed marine farm locate dwest of Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay Complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.       Davidson, R. J. 20. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.       Davidson, R. J. 20. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay Complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.       Davidson, R. J. 20. Additional information com a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.       Davidson, R. J. 20. Advidson Environmene			
5. Size     M (medium)     M (medium)     M (medium)       6. Connectivity     L (low)     M (medium)     M (medium)       7. Catchment     L (low)     L (low)     L (low)       Comments     One of the better examples of a sheltered reef inside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the reef from adjacent marine farms     Other significant reef sites known from Beatrix Bay area.       Recommendations     Adjust boundaries to encompass reef structure.     Adopt adjusted boundaries.       REFERENCES     Pavidson, R.J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm Set4. Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound. Survey and Monitoring report No. 384. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.       Bavidson, R. J. 2000. Rom 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm Set4. Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay     Consected west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.       Bavidson, R. J. 2000. Rom 1999. Biological report no ra proposed marine farm Set4. Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay     Consected west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.	4. Distinctiveness		
6. Connectivity     L(low)     M (medium)       7. Catchment     L(low)     L(low)       Comments     One of the better examples of a sheltered reef inside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the reef from adjacent marine farms     Cheer significant reef sites known from Beatrix Bay area.       Recommendations     Adjust boundaries to encompass reef structure.     Adopt adjusted boundaries.       REFERENCES     Davidson, R.J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound. Survey and Cheer Structure.     Adopt adjusted boundaries.       Represented by Davidson, R.J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay Conserve and Cheer Structure.     Complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.       Davidson, R. J., D. Rorown 1999. Biological report for the reconsenting of marine farm BS44, Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay Conserve and monitoring report no. 866.     Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.       Davidson, R. J., D. Rorown 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Plorus Sound.     Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.			
Z. Catchment     L (low)     L (low)       Comments     One of the better examples of a sheltered reel inside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the reel from adjacent marine farms were observed.     Other significant reef sites known from Beatrix Bay area.       Recommendations     Adjust boundaries to encompass reef structure.     Adopt adjusted boundaries.       ReFERENCES     Davidson, R.J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 344, Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.     Image: Commendation of the reconsenting of marine farm S44, Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay Complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A and S. King.     Image: Complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A and S. King.       Davidson, R. J. J. D. Rown 1999. Biological report for the reconsenting of marine farm S44, Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay Complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A and S. King.     Image: Complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A and S. King.       Davidson, R. J. J. D. Rown 1999. Biological report for the reconsenting of marine farm S44, Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.     Image: Complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A and S. King.	6. Connectivity		
Comments         One of the better examples of a sheltered reef inside Pelorus Sound. No impacts on the reef from adjacent marine farms were observed.         Other significant reef sites known from Beatrix Bay area.           Recommendations         Adjust boundaries to encompass reef structure.         Adopt adjusted boundaries.           REFERENCES         Davidson, R.J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.         Adopt adjusted boundaries.           Davidson, R.J. and Richards, LA. 2017. Biological report for the reconsenting of marine farm BS44, Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Lid. for Andrew King. Survey and monitoring report no. 866.         Gavidson, R.J.; D. A. Brown 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm forcated west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.         Seconder			
were observed.         were observed.         definition           Recommendations         Adjust boundaries to encompass reef structure.         Adopt adjusted boundaries.           REFERENCES         Davidson, R.J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine fam located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.         Adopt adjusted boundaries.           Davidson, R.J. and Richards, LA. 2017. Biological report for the reconsenting of marine farm 8544, Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Lit. Information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.         Editional Information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Lit. Information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.         Editional Information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.	Comments		Other significant reef sites known from Beatrix Bay area.
Recommendations         Adjust boundaries to encompass reef structure.         Adopt adjusted boundaries.           REFERENCES         Davidson, R. J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.         Davidson, R.J. and Richards, LA. 2017. Biological report for the reconsenting of marine farm B544, Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd. for Andrew King. Survey and monitoring report no. 866.         Davidson, R.J., J. D. Rorwn 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm B544, Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.			
REFERENCES Davidson, R. J., 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound, Survey and Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King. Davidson, R. J. and Richards, L.A. 2017. Biological report for the reconsenting of marine farm 8544, Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd. for Andrew King. Survey and monitoring report no. 3866. Davidson, R. J.; D. A. Brown 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm focated west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.	Recommendations		Adopt adjusted boundaries.
Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King. Davidson, R. J. and Richards, L.A. 2017. Biological report for the reconsenting of marine farm 8544. Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd. for Andrew King. Survey and monitoring report no. 866. Davidson, R. J.; D. A. Brown 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm 8544. Prepared by Pavidson.			
Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King. Davidson, R. J. and Richards, L.A. 2017. Biological report for the reconsenting of marine farm 8544. Grant Bay, Clova-Crail Bay complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd. for Andrew King. Survey and monitoring report no. 866. Davidson, R. J.; D. A. Brown 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm 8544. Prepared by Pavidson.	REFERENCES	Davidson, R.J. 2000. Additional information on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound. Survey and	
complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd. for Andrew King. Survey and monitoring report no. 866. Davidson, R. J.; D. A. Brown 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.		Monitoring Report No. 344. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. and S. King.	
Davidson, R. J.; D. A. Brown 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Bay, Pelorus Sound.			
		complex. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd. for Andrew King. Survey and monitoring report no. 866.	
Prepared by Davidson Environmental Limited for A. J. and S. A. King. Survey and Monitoring Report No. 226.		Davidson R. L. D. A. Brown 1999. Biological report on a proposed marine farm located west of Grant Pay. Pelorus Sound	

# Site 3.22 Tawhitinui Bay (king shag colony)

name material12Auton (1)MaterialAuton (2)MaterialAuton (2)MaterialAuto	Site Registration Datail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
memberNew Case (approximation of the section of the sect	Site Registration Detail (original) Site number		
increaseAdvance in some of a second of particular data in the second of part	Site name		3.22
Second state         Second state<	Site description		
generation of a status is the use of a status is the status is	Site description		
share and the second se			
gird Ackgring of albiteIn the Schlager of Calceler		photos were collected. A previous aerial survey counted 43 birds and 16 active nests (Schuckard <i>et al.</i> , 2015).	
Image: A provide a set of the start of the star	Ecological description of attributes		
Back Catego Section 100 Section			
Back Catego Section 100 Section		at least 240 years (NZ birds online). King shags are restricted to the outer Marlborough Sounds, from the west coast of D'Urville Island east to where	
Base of the second se		Queen Charlotte Sound and Cook Strait meet. About 85% of all existing birds are located at five colonies: Rahuinui Island, Duffers Reef, Trio Islands,	
Back per wreight dright integration werking being			
wijz Aug, make, sitz and die gewähe, weisener konstructure in A. In iterational unter Geser weisener Auge and mit and auter			
Interd definition 3 Marcele to selected base Data Bas			
Reference in the species considered interactive due to the top species consists in the upper lange interactive. Note that population to the upper lange interactive in the upper lange interactive. Note that population to the upper lange interactive in the upper lange interactive. Note that population to the upper lange interactive in the upper lange interactive interactinteractive interactive interactive interactive interactive intera			
main output ou			
Bays 111 (a) both the bas 300 the next next 01 is population terms in February 300 isotening of Spain (a) both the set of Spa			
args of a second of a sec			
Resplay and the dynamic and the dynamic and the dynamic and the dynamic and the dynamic			
Idencing information of region in second of the content of the co	Biogeographic area		
of originationHome is a constraint of the state of the sta	Level of original information		
mbiologic space	Date of original assessment		
controlcontrolWork (rescue)We may any 2000Work (rescue)We have any 2000Work (rescue)We have any 2000We have any 2000We have any 2000Stand and any 2000We have any 2000Stand any 2000We have any 2000Work (rescue)We have any 2000We have any 2000 <tr< td=""><td>Report</td><td></td><td></td></tr<>	Report		
SinguindMagine (2017, 2019, 2019, 2019)1000000000000000000000000000000000000			
SinguindMagine (2017, 2019, 2019, 2019)1000000000000000000000000000000000000	Field work (present)		
Itage in the second s	Date	4 September, 2017; 25 January 2018	
stard angline of weight of the set of the se	Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental	
stard angline of weight of the set of the se	Personnel	Rob Davidson, Laura Richards, Courtney Rayes, Tom Scott-Simmonds	
his des a displicant to (ba) bit is the field of a semi-observe to the formation of the field of a semi-observe to the formation of the field of a semi-observe to the formation of the field of a semi-observe to the formation of the field of a semi-observe to the formation of the field of a semi-observe to the formation of the field of a semi-observe to the formation of the field	Site Characteristics		
space of adaption	Original area of significant site (ha)	0.16	
ine same in ange (a) in a fact fait of a same i end a de a fait i fait of a de a de a fait i end a de	Suggested revision of significant site (ha)		
e dimai de classi de la betrer de set en de de s	Marine zone	Terrestrial	
Hods         Description (standbedication)           total descenses         Observation (standbedication)           total descenses         Total quarter descenses           total descenses         Total quarter descenses <td>Depth range (m)</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Depth range (m)		
Note of assessment         Protographic funding is surface)	Wave Climate	Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
Note of assessment         Protographic funding is surface)			
Determine         Determine           Stratum (revised site)         Introduction of the formation of the main of the formation of the main of the formation of the main of the formation of the f	Methods		
Intervised site)         Intervised site)           Stratum (revised site)         Bedrock           Stratum (revised site)         Vis.	Method of assessment		
than justicing unique 30% cover j priorital species (revised site) important species (revised site) important species (revised site) intervised is present? outst species 1 set status is statu		Observations	
than justicing unique 30% cover j priorital species (revised site) important species (revised site) important species (revised site) intervised is present? outst species 1 set status is statu			
Wind Provide State			
important species present?         is definition           Orient species 1         Registant and the species 1           Set stass         Revealed on fishing in proximity           Best species 1         Set stass           Set stass         Revealed on fishing in proximity           Set stass <t< td=""><td>Substrata (widespread and dominant &gt;50% cover)</td><td>Bedrock</td><td></td></t<>	Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Bedrock	
important species present?         is definition           Orient species 1         Registant and the species 1           Set stass         Revealed on fishing in proximity           Best species 1         Set stass           Set stass         Revealed on fishing in proximity           Set stass <t< td=""><td>Important species (revised site)</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Important species (revised site)		
is stam in a kalonally endangered in the standard end is a standar	Are important species present?	Yes	
Benef type (If spelicitatie)         Interact Section           age and inpacts noted         Face-attorn finding in proximity           of dimage at activity observed         Disturbance to birds, potential chick mortalities           of dimage at activity observed         Human presence disturbance           of dimage at activity observed         Expert and assessment           inflame at a significant tite (Ins)         0.16           of dimage at activity observed         No change           between attern at	Important species 1		
man langet 5 gea of a vinget 5 gea of a vinget 5 of dange of a vinget 6 of	Species status	Nationally endangered	
age and impacts noted of informatis tel federad of damage or activity observed of damage or a	Biogenic type (if applicable)		
Description         Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<>	Human Impacts		
Ide Image         Disturbance         Disturbance           of damage or scivity observed         whama presence disturbance         whama presence disturbance           of damage or scivity observed         whama presence disturbance         whama presence disturbance           of damage or scivity observed         science disturbance         per panel assessment information           Infact and sci fight[Gantatise [ha]         0.16         0.16           Integrade sci fight[Gantatise [ha]         0.16         0.16           Integrade sci fight[Gantatise [ha]         0.16         0.16           Integrade sci fight[Gantatise [ha]         0.16	Damage and or impacts noted		
or of damage or xtilvity observed or of damage or xtilvity observed or damage or xtilvity observed         Imma presence disturbance         Spect parel assessment of damage or xtilvity observed           NIFICANT SITE SUMMARY         Existing and present survey information         Spect parel assessment of damage or xtilvity observed         Spect parel assessment 0.16         0.16           In are or dignificant site (ha)         0.16         0.16         0.16           In are or dignificant site (ha)         0.16         0.16         0.16           In are or dignificant site (ha)         0.16         0.16         0.16           In are or dignificant site (ha)         0.16         0.07         0.07           Intege change change from original ares (h)         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           Intege change change from original ares (h)         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           Intege change change from original ares (h)         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           Intege change change change change (hange)         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           Intege change cha			
e of damage or activity observed or of d	Level of impact		
e of damage or activity observed i of damage or activity observed		numan presence disturbance	
e of damage or activity observed INFICANT SITE SUMMARY Site and present survey information India area of significant site (ha) U16			
NFICANT STE SUMMARY         Existing and present survey information         Depet panel assessment           Inal area of significant site (ha)         0.16         0.16           some ned area of significant site (ha)         0.16         0.16           on a ment site (ha)         0.16         0.16           oppendic disturbance         0.07%         0.07%           setting and present site (ha)         0.07%         0.0%           or oppendic disturbance         0.0%         0.0%           sessment criteria scores (original)         Assessment criteria scores (present review)           with the sessment criteria scores (original)         M(medium)           virsity         High         M(medium)           virsity         High         M(medium)           virsity         High)         M(medium)           mentsity         M(medium) <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
ind area of significant site (ha) ind ar	,,	•	4
ind area of significant site (ha) ind ar	SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
nomende area of significant site (ha)         0.16         0.16           age to ofginal site         No change         No change           age to had ge (ha)         O         O           entage change from original area (N)         D/%         D/%           upogenic disturbance         Moderate         D/%           isophal state (hange from original area (N)         D/%         D/%           upogenic disturbance         Moderate         D/%           isophal state stores (present review)         High         D/%           upogenic vulnerability         High         Micedium         Micedium           stinctiveness         Micedium         Micedium         Micedium           versity         I (how)         Micedium         Micedium           stinctiveness         Micedium         Micedium         Micedium           versity         I (how)         Micedium         Micedium           uponectivity         Micedium         Micedium         Micedium           uponectivity         No         Micedium         No           uponectivity         Micedium         Micedium         No           uponectivity         No         Micedium         No           uponectivity         N			
spe to original site         No change         No change           op openic disturbance         0%         0.0%           ropogenic disturbance         Moderate         0.0%           ropogenic disturbance         Moderate         0.0%           sistemet view spesitive         High         0.0%           sistemet view spesitive         Modeium         Assessmet criteria scores (present review)           Minedium         Minedium         Minedium           rifty         High         Minedium         Minedium           sinctiveness         Minedium         Minedium         Minedium           sinctiveness         Minedium         Minedium         Minedium           sinctiveness         Minedium         Minedium         Minedium           sinctiveness         Minedium         Minedium         Minedium           sinctiveness         Liow         Minedium         Minedium           sinctiveness         Minedium         Minedium         Minedium           sinde colonites         Schuckard colony, fourth highers nu			
reg (h)       0       0         centage from original area (%)       0       0         vopogenic disturbance iss/habita sensitivity       Moderate       0.0%         siss/habita sensitivity       High	Change to original site		
Constrained change from original area (%)         Constrained chang	Change (ha)	0	0
morpogenic disturbance dise/habitat sensitivity         Moderate Extremely sensitive Hgh         Moderate Extremely sensitive Hgh         Moderate Extremely sensitive Hgh         Moderate Extremely sensitive Hgh         Moderate Extremely sensitive Hgh         Moderate Extremely sensitive Hgh         Assessment criteria scores (present review)           sssment criteria scores (original)         Assessment criteria scores (present review)         Moderate M(medium)           sssment criteria scores (original)         Moderate M(medium)         M(medium)           stinctiveness         M(medium)         M(medium)           stinctiveness         M(medium)         M(medium)           ee         L(low)         M(medium)           ments         L(low)         M(medium)           ments         Continue to monitor ste.         Largest mainland colony, fourth highest number of nests for all colonies (Schuckard et al., 2018). Within flying range of Duffer Reef, Sentinel and Island Colonies.           stand Continue to monitor site.         Fortect from disturbance. Investigate options for protection from predators. Investigate options to encourage birds to establish site on Maud Island. Continue to monitor site.         Schuckard, R. 2006. Population status of the New Zealand king shag (Leucocarbo carunculatus). Notomis 53: 297-307.         Schuckard, R. 2014, M; Forst, P; Taylor, G; Greene, T. 2018. A census of	Percentage change from original area (%)	0.0%	0.0%
isedendiate sensitivity         Extremely sensitive         Extremely sensitive         Isedendiate sensitivity           wropsgenic vulnerability         High         Assessment criteria scores (original)         Assessment criteria scores (present review)           sessment criteria scores (original)         M (medium)         M (medium)           rinty         High         M (medium)           versity         L(low)         L(low)           stinctiveness         M (medium)         M (medium)           versity         L(low)         L(low)           stinctiveness         M (medium)         M (medium)           versity         M (medium)         M (medium)           ments         L(low)         M (medium)           ments         Na         Na           stand colony. fourth highest number of nests for all colonies (schudard et al., 2018). Within flying range of Duffer Reef, Sentinel and Island colonies.           stand continue to monitor site.         Sinckard, R. 2006. Population status of the New Zealand king shag (Leucocarbo carunculatus). Notomis 53: 297-307.         Schukard, R. 2014, M, Frost, P.; Taylor, G; Greene, T. 2018. A census of Status of the New Zealand king shag (Leucocarbo carunculatus). Notomis 53: 297-307.			
Image and construction of the state of the stat	Anthropogenic disturbance		
Asessment criteria scores (original) Medium/ Medium/ Medium/ Medium/ Helpi/ Helpi/ Liow/ Medium/ Medium/ Helpi/ Helpi/ Liow/ Medium/ Helpi/ He	Species/habitat sensitivity		
spesentativeness     M (medium)     M (medium)       withy     H (high)     H (high)       H (high)     H (high)     H (high)       Ulow     H (high)     H (high)       stinctiveness     M (medium)     M (medium)       ze     L (low)     M (medium)       thment     M (medium)     M (medium)       onnectivity     M (medium)     M (medium)       ments     Contract of next for all colonies     Schuckard et al., 2018). Within flying range of Duffer Reef, Sentinel and Island. colonies.       symmendations     Protect from disturbance. Investigate options for protection from predators. Investigate options to encourage birds to establish site on Maud     Island colonies.	Anthropogenic vulnerability	High	
spesentativeness     M (medium)     M (medium)       withy     H (high)     H (high)       H (high)     H (high)     H (high)       Ulow     H (high)     H (high)       stinctiveness     M (medium)     M (medium)       ze     L (low)     M (medium)       thment     M (medium)     M (medium)       onnectivity     M (medium)     M (medium)       ments     Contract of next for all colonies     Schuckard et al., 2018). Within flying range of Duffer Reef, Sentinel and Island. colonies.       symmendations     Protect from disturbance. Investigate options for protection from predators. Investigate options to encourage birds to establish site on Maud     Island colonies.			
writy     H (high)     H (high)     H (high)       versity     L (low)     L (low)       versity     L (low)     M (medium)       versity     M (medium)     NA       ments     Schuckard et al., 2018). Within flying range of Duffer Reef, Sentinel and Island. Colonies.       versity     Protect from disturbance. Investigate options for protection from predators. Investigate options to encourage birds to establish site on Maud Island. Colonies.			
versity     [/low]     [/low]     [/low]       stinctiveness     M(medium)     M(medium)       ce     [/low]     M(medium)       onnectivity     M(medium)     M(medium)       namedia     NA     NA       sinctiveness     Na     Na       uments     Schuckard et al., 2018. Within flying range of Duffer Reef, Sentinel and Island Colonies.     Schuckard et al., 2018. Within flying range of Duffer Reef, Sentinel and Island colonies.	1. Representativeness 2. Rarity		
stinctiveness M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) 2e (low) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) 2e (low) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) 2e (low) M (medium) M	2. Rarity 3. Diversity		
ze     L(low)     M (medium)     M (medium)       sinnectivity     M (medium)     M (medium)       NA     M (high)     M (high)       uments     Image: mainland colony, fourth highest number of nests for all colonies       signed mainland colony, fourth highest number of nests for all colonies.       promendations     Protect. from disturbance. Investigate options for protection from predators. Investigate options to encourage birds to establish site on Maud       tisland. Continue to monitor site.     Schuckard, R. 2006. Population status of the New Zealand king shag ( <i>Leucocarbo carunculatus</i> ). Notomis 53: 297-307.	4. Distinctiveness		
M(medium)     H(high)       NA     NA       ments     Iargest mainland colony, fourth highest number of nests for all colonies (Schuckard et al., 2018). Within flying range of Duffer Reef, Sentinel and Island Colonies.       pmendations     Protect. from disturbance. Investigate options for protection from predators. Investigate options to encourage birds to establish site on Maud Island. Continue to monitor site.	5. Size		
NA     NA       Iments     NA       Iments     Iments       Imendations     Protect from disturbance. Investigate options for protection from predators. Investigate options to encourage birds to establish site on Maud       Island. Continue to monitor site.	6. Connectivity		
ments       Largest mainland colony, fourth highest number of nests for all colonies.         sommendations       Protect from disturbance. Investigate options for protection from predators. Investigate options to encourage birds to establish site on Maud       Island Continue to monitor site.         EFERCES       Schuckard, R. 2006. Population status of the New Zealand king shag (Leucocarbo carunculatus). Notomis 53: 297-307.       Schuckard, R.; Bell, M.; Frost, P.; Taylor, G.; Greene, T. 2018. A census of	7. Catchment		NA
Chuckard et al., 2018). Within flying range of Duffer Reef, Sentinel and Island. Continue to monitor site.      ERENCES     Schuckard, R. 2006. Population status of the New Zealand king shag ( <i>Leucocarbo carunculatus</i> ). Notornis 53: 297-307.     Schuckard, R.; Bell, M.; Frost, P.; Taylor, G.; Greene, T. 2018. A census of	Comments		Largest mainland colony, fourth highest number of nests for all colonies
Fore Carl from disturbance. Investigate options for protection from predators. Investigate options to encourage birds to establish site on Maud     Island. Continue to monitor site.      FERENCES     Schuckard, R. 2006. Population status of the New Zealand king shag ( <i>Leucocarbo carunculatus</i> ). Notomis 53: 297-307.     Schuckard, R.; Bell, M.; Frost, P.; Taylor, G.; Greene, T. 2018. A census of			(Schuckard et al., 2018). Within flying range of Duffer Reef, Sentinel and Tr
EFENCES Schuckard, R. 2006. Population status of the New Zealand king shag ( <i>Leucocarbo carunculatus</i> ). Notomis 53: 297-307. Schuckard, R.; Bell, M.; Frost, P.; Taylor, G.; Greene, T. 2018. A census of			
ERENCES Schuckard, R. 2006. Population status of the New Zealand king shag (Leucocarbo carunculatus). Notomis 53: 297-307. Schuckard, R.; Bell, M.; Frost, P.; Taylor, G.; Greene, T. 2018. A census of	Recommendations	Protect from disturbance. Investigate options for protection from predators. Investigate options to encourage birds to establish site on Maud	
ERENCES Schuckard, R. 2006. Population status of the New Zealand king shag ( <i>Leucocarbo carunculatus</i> ). Notornis 53: 297-307. Schuckard, R.; Bell, M.; Frost, P.; Taylor, G.; Greene, T. 2018. A census of nestine pairs of the endemic New Zealand king			
ERENCES Schuckard, R. 2006. Population status of the New Zealand king shag (Leucocarbo carunculatus). Notomis 53: 297-307. Schuckard, R.; Bell, M.; Frost, P.; Taylor, G.; Greene, T. 2018. A census of nestine pairs of the endemic New Zealand king			
nesting pairs of the endemic New Zealand king		Schuckard, R. 2006. Population status of the New Zealand king shag (Leucocarbo carunculatus). Notornis 53: 297-307.	
	REFERENCES		
shag (Leucocarbo carunculatus) in 2016 and 2017. Notomis 65 (2): 59–66.	REFERENCES		

# Site 3.22 Woodlands west (rhodolith bed)

Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Site number	3.22	3.22
Site name	Woodlands (west) rhodolith bed	
Site description	The rhodolith bed is located in a small unnamed bay located west of Woodlands, along the northern coastline of Tawhitinui Reach. The bay is approximately 4.1 ha in size and the entrance to the bay is approximately 400 m in width.	
	Reach. The bay is approximately 4.1 ha in size and the entrance to the bay is approximately 400 m in width.	
Ecological description of attributes	The rhodolith bed is small compared to other beds known from Marlborough measuring 0.2 ha or approximately 79 m in length and between 18 m to 38 m in width (Davidson and Richards, 2016; Davidson <i>et al.</i> , 2018). Depths ranged from 12.8 m	
	to 18.5 m. Davidson and Richards (2016) stated that comparable sea floor depths were located all around the bed, however,	
	the rhodoliths were not recorded anywhere outside a defined zone.	
Biogeographic area	Pelorus Sound	
Level of original information	3. Quantitative internal report	
Date of original assessment	10/08/2016	
Report	Davidson, R.J.; Richards L.A.; Scott-Simmonds, T. 2018. Biological monitoring of a rhodolith bed located adjacent to mussel	
	farm (8177) in Tawhitinui Reach, Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd. for Talley's Group Limited. Survey	
	and monitoring report no. 882.	
Field work (present)		_
Date	NA (site based on other studies)	
Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental	
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Laura Richards, Tom Scott-Simmonds	]
Site Characteristics		1
Original area of significant site (ha)	Unknown	
Suggested revision of significant site (ha) Marine zone	0.188 Sublitteral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Marine zone Depth range (m)	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf) 12.8 - 18.5	
Wave Climate	12.8 - 18.5 Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
Methods		1
Method of assessment	Drop camera (cable remote)	1
and a bisessment	HD photographs (remote underwater)	
	HD video (remote underwater)	
Substratum (revised site)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		1
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Fine sand	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Silt	
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)		1
Are important species present?	Yes	
	Rhodolith bed Biogenic habitat forming	
Important species 1		
Species status		
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable)	Rhodoliths	
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts	Rhodoliths	]
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable)		]
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted	Rhodoliths	]
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts	Rhodoliths Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.	
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected	Rhodoliths           Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.           < 10%	
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of damage Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed Type of solved	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of damage Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of damage Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Expert panel assessment
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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)	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha)	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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) Recommended area of significant site (ha)	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha)	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha)	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         10%         High         Anchor marks on benthos         Existing and present survey information         Unknown         0.2         Increase         0.2	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 Chanage (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         10%         High         Anchor marks on benthos         Existing and present survey information         Unknown         0.2         Increase         0.2	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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) Change to original area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 Chanage (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Rechange to riginal site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Assessment criteria scores	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review)
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Assessment criteria scores L Representativeness	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium)
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of damage or activity observed 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) Rechange to noiginal area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high)
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         10%         High         Anchor marks on benthos         Existing and present survey information         Unknown         0.2         Increase         0.2         NA         Moderate         Extremely sensitive         Moderate         Assessment criteria scores (original)         M (medium)         M (medium)         M (nsidum)	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium)
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of damage or activity observed 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) Rechange to noiginal area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium)
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Resent original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium)
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Rechange to riginal site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habita tensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) L(low) L(low) L(low)
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         10%         High         Anchor marks on benthos         Existing and present survey information         Unknown         0.2         Increase         0.2         NA         Moderate         Extremely sensitive         Moderate         Intrease         (Inclum)         M (medium)         M (medium)         M (medium)         M (medium)         M (medium)         H (high)	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) L (low) L (low)
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Respective ty a set of the set of	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) Rare biogenic habitat (31.4 ha known from Sounds). Sterile = low connectivity to nearby site.
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic rulenrability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low)
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cachment Comments Recommendations	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         10%         High         Anchor marks on benthos         Existing and present survey information         Unknown         0.2         Increase         0.2         NA         Moderate         Extremely sensitive         Moderate         Increase         (Inclum)         M (medium)         Create new significant site	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) L (high) M (medium) L (how) L (low) L (low) L (low) E (low) Sterile a proved.
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Respective ty a set of the set of	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) L (haw) L (haw) L (haw) L (haw) L (haw) Sterile = low connectivity to nearby site. Site approved.
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cathment Comments Recommendations	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         10%         High         Anchor marks on benthos         Existing and present survey information         Unknown         0.2         Increase         0.2         NA         Moderate         Extremely sensitive         Moderate         Rasessment criteria scores (original)         M (medium)         M (medium)         M (medium)         H (high)         M (medium)         H (high)         M (medium)         H (high)         Create mew significant site         Davidson, R.J.; Richards LA. 2016. Biological monitoring of a rhodolith bed located adjacent to a mussel farm (8117) located	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) U (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) E (low) E (low) Site approved. Site approved. Site approved. Site approved. Site approved.
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cathment Comments Recommendations	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) L (haw) L (haw) L (haw) L (haw) L (haw) Ster approved. Nelson, W.A. 2009. Calcified macroalgae – critical to coastal ecosystems and
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level 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 (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cachment Comments Recommendations	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) E (low) E (low) Site approved. Site approve
Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of damage Type of damage or activity observed Species/nabitat sensitivity Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Cathment Comments Recommendations	Rhodoliths         Anchor block drag marks. Probably occurred when old mussel farm was relocated further from shore.         < 10%	Unknown 0.2 Increase 0.2 NA Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) H (high) M (medium) U (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low) E (low) E (low) Site approved. Site approved. Site approved. Site approved. Site approved.

# Site 3.24 Tuhitarata Reef

Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Site number Site name	3.24 Tuhitarata reef	3.24
Site description	Tunitarata reer Tunitarata Bay is small and located at the south end of Beatrix Bay approximately 40 km by sea from Havelock. Tunitarata Bay has a	
	coastline length of approximately 1.9 km and covers an area of sea of approximately 37 ha. The mouth of the Bay is approximately 950	
	m wide.	
Ecological description of attributes	A large reef is located on the eastern side of Tuhitarata Bay. This reef is approximately 3.4 ha is size and as such is one of the largest	
	single reef structures within Pelorus Sound. Approximately 10 ha of inshore areas of the bay have been colonised by a Chaetopteridae	
	tubeworm. It is probable this species is exotic and arrived in the Sounds in the mid to late 1990's. In high densities this species forms a	
	low relief biogenic structure.	
Biogeographic area	Pelorus Sound	
Level of original information Date of original assessment	2. Qualitative internal report 06/09/2011	
Report	Davidson, R.J.; Richards, L.A. 2011. Ecological report for a proposed marine farm application located in Tuhitarata Bay, Beatrix Bay,	
	Pelorus Sound. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd. for Knight-Somerville Partnership. Survey and monitoring report no. 703.	
Field work (present)		1
Date	24 January 2018	1
Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental	
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Laura Richards, Courtney Rayes, Tom Scott-Simmonds	
Site Characteristics		•
Original area of significant site (ha)		
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	3.398 (reef)	
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (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)	ווט אונכי (וכוווטנכ טווטפושמנפו)	
Substratum (revised site) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Boulder	1
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Cobble	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Fine sand	
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)	Bedrock	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Important species (revised site)	1	1
Are important species present?	No	1
Important species 1		
Species status		
Human Impacts		
	Localised shell debris near mussel farms	
Damage and or impacts noted	Localised shell debris hear mussel ranns	
Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected		
Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact		
Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	Introduced or exotic species	
Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed		
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	Introduced or exotic species	
Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	Introduced or exotic species	
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	Introduced or exotic species	Expert panel assessment
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 Type of damage or activity observed	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture	Expert panel assessment
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 Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha)	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture	Expert panel assessment
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 SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information	
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 Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change (ha)	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information	
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 SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change to original site	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information	
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 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 (%)	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information	
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 Type of damage or activity observed SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha) Change (ha)	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha	
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 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	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low	
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low	3.4ha
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 SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY Original area of significant site (ha) Change to original site Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habita sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review)
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium)
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L (low)
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic unlerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L (low) M (medium)
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barity	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L (low)
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original)	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L (low) M (medium) L (low) H (high)
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture  Existing and present survey information  3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original)  Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterurs littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the pardment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large area of shallow sea have been invaded by the wom, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, divers reported	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of has eab ed covered in parchment-like (http://www.seafrinds.org	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the pardment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large area of shallow sea have been invaded by the wom, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, divers reported	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wkipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of the sea bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafirinds.org.nz/indept/livasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes benek into millions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafirinds.org.nz/indept/livasion.htm).	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipers reported seeing whole areas of the sea bave been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedius</i> . Since about 1995, Joinger area of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedius</i> . Since about 1995, Joinger area of shallow sea have been invested that litter our beaches, decarging very slowly. Large beds of <i>Chaetopterus</i> were observed in Grove Arm, inner Queen Charlotte Sound in 1989-90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly <i>Lenormandia chauvini</i> ) and invertebrates (e.g. <i>Carbula, Pecten, Chiradata</i> ) (C. Duffy pers. obs.).	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of shael bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafrinds.org.nz/indepth/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into millions of parchment shreds that litter our beaches, decaying very slowy. Large beds of Chaetopterus were observed in Grove Arm, inner Queen Charlotte Scound in 1999-90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly Lenormandia chauvini) and invertebrates (e.g. Carbulo, Pecten, Chirodota ) (C. Duffy pers. obs.). C. variopedatus builds and lives permanently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft substrate with both ends	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, divers reported seeing whole areas of the sea bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.nz/indepth/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes breake hinto millions of parchment shreak that ittler our beaches, decarging very slowly. Large beds of <i>Chectopterus</i> were observed in Growe Arm, inner Queen Charlotte Sound in 1999-90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly <i>Lenormandia</i> chauvini) an tough, flexible, papery U-Ishapet tube buried in soft substrate with both ends protruding like little chimneys. The worm itself is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimetres long. The anterior end	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of the sae bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.nz/indepth/linvasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into millions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.nz/indepth/linvasion.htm). Washed is seaweeds (particularly <i>Lenormandia chauvini</i> ) and invertebrates (e.g. <i>Carbula, Pecten, Chiradota</i> ) (C. Duffy pers. obs.). C. variopedatus builds and lives permanently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft substrate with both ends protruding like little chimneys. The worm itself is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimeters long. The anterior end is short and has bristle-bearing segments. and a shovel-like mouth. The middle section bears parapodia. On the 12th segment these	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of the sea bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.safrieds.org.nz/indepth/invison.thm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into millions of parchment shreds that litter our beaches, decaying very slowly. Large beds of Chaetopterus were observed in Grove Arm, inner Queen Charlotte Sound in 1999-90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly Lenormadia chauvini) and invertebrate (e.g., Corbul, Patent, Chirdotta) (I.C. buff yners, obs.). C. variopedatus builds and lives permanentily in a tough, flexible, papery U-Japed tube burdy-five centimetres long. The anterior end is short and has bristle-bearing segments and a shove-like mouth. The middle section bears parapodia. On the 12th segment these are modified into long wing-like structures which secrete mucus and form a bag. The parapodia on segments 13, 34 and 15 are fusce	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, Jage areas of shallow scale have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedius</i> . Since about 1995, Jaye areas of shallow scale have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedius</i> . Since about 1995, Jaye areas of shallow scale have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedius</i> . Since about 1996, Jaye areas of shallow scale have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedius</i> . Jaye Beds of <i>Chaetopterus</i> were observed in Grove Arm, Inner Queen Charlotte Sound in 1999. On any ere colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly <i>Lenormandia chauvini</i> ) and invertebrates (e.g. <i>Corbulo, Pecten, Chiradota</i> ) (C. Duffy pers. obs.). C. <i>variopedius</i> builds and lives permaently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft subtrate with both ends protruding like little chinneys. The worm itseff is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimetres long. The anterior end protruding like little chinneys, the worm itseff is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimetres long. The anterior end protruding like little chinneys. The worm itseff is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimetres long. The anterior end protruding like little chinneys. The worm itseff is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimetres long. The anterior end protruding like little chinneys. The worm itseff is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimetres long. The anterior end protruding like little chinneys. The worm itseff is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimetres long. The anterior end protruding l	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of the sea bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.safrieds.org.nz/indepth/invison.thm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into millions of parchment shreds that litter our beaches, decaying very slowly. Large beds of Chaetopterus were observed in Grove Arm, inner Queen Charlotte Sound in 1999-90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly Lenormadia chauvini) and invertebrate (e.g., Corbul, Patent, Chirdotta) (I.C. buff yners, obs.). C. variopedatus builds and lives permanentily in a tough, flexible, papery U-Japed tube burdy-five centimetres long. The anterior end is short and has bristle-bearing segments and a shove-like mouth. The middle section bears parapodia. On the 12th segment these are modified into long wing-like structures which secrete mucus and form a bag. The parapodia on segments 13, 34 and 15 are fusce	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Asseessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be C. variopedratus. Since about 1995, large areas of these as bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.nz/indepth/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into millions of parchment shreds that litter our beaches, decaying very slowly. Large beds of Chectopterus were observed in Grove Arm, inner Queen Charlotte Sound in 1999.90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly Lenormandia chauvini) and invertebrates (e.g. Carbula, Pecten, Chiradata ) (C. Duffy pers. obs.). C. variopedatus builds and lives permanently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft substrate with both ends protruding like little chimneys. The worm itself is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimeres long. The amentiore edit is short and has bristle-bearing segments and as shore-like mouth. The middle section bears parapodia. On the 12th segment these are modified into long wing-like structures which secrete mucus and form a bag. The parapodia on segments 10, at 13, 44 and 15 are fused into three paddle-shaped, plate dives dwhole. The posterior edwhole is top may mater through the tube. The water is drawn in through the anterior end and expelled through the posterior end passing through the fine mesh of the mucus bag where food particles get trapped. The mucus bag is later rolled up and passed by a convery role to thipping hairs in the cliated dorsal grove to the mouth where it is swallowed whole. The posterior hand role worn is segmented and tapers towards the	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedatus</i> . Since about 1995, have tubes break into millions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafind.org.nz/indepti/livasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into millions of parchment shires that tilter our beaches, decaying very slowly. Large beds of <i>Chaetopterus</i> swere observed in Grove Arm, inner Queen Charlotte Sound in 1999-90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly <i>Lenormandia</i> chauvini) and invertebrates (e.g. <i>Carbula</i> , Pecter, <i>Chiradato</i> ) (C. Duffy pers. obs.). <i>C. variopedatus</i> builds and lives permanently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft substrate with both ends protruding like little chimesy. The worm itself is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimetres long. The anterior end is short and hab bristle-bearing segments and a shovel-like mouth. The middle section bears parapodia. On the 12th segment these are modified into long wing-like structures, which secrete mouca and form a bags. The parapodia and the 2th segment these are modified into long wing-like structures, bub pursoed by a conveyor bet of whiphing hairs in the ciliated borsal groove to articles get trapped. The mouchs bags is later roled by	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 Significant Site SubMARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Asseessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be C. variopedratus. Since about 1995, large areas of these as bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.nz/indepth/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into millions of parchment shreds that litter our beaches, decaying very slowly. Large beds of Chectopterus were observed in Grove Arm, inner Queen Charlotte Sound in 1999.90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly Lenormandia chauvini) and invertebrates (e.g. Carbula, Pecten, Chiradata ) (C. Duffy pers. obs.). C. variopedatus builds and lives permanently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft substrate with both ends protruding like little chimneys. The worm itself is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimeres long. The amentiore edit is short and has bristle-bearing segments and as shore-like mouth. The middle section bears parapodia. On the 12th segment these are modified into long wing-like structures which secrete mucus and form a bag. The parapodia on segments 10, at 13, 44 and 15 are fused into three paddle-shaped, plate dives dwhole. The posterior edwhole is top may mater through the tube. The water is drawn in through the anterior end and expelled through the posterior end passing through the fine mesh of the mucus bag where food particles get trapped. The mucus bag is later rolled up and passed by a convery role to thipping hairs in the cliated dorsal grove to the mouth where it is swallowed whole. The posterior hand role worn is segmented and tapers towards the	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic disturbance Secies/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Barrity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture  Existing and present survey information  3.4 ha  Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original)  Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wkipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of the seal bed covered in parchment-like tubes (Inter/Interior education) and the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wkipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of the seal bed covered in parchment-like tubes (Inter/Invession, ang/Indept/Invision, Inth). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into millions of parchment shreds that litter our beaches, decaying very stowy. Large beds of Chaetopterus were observed in Grove Arm, inner Queen Charlotte Sound in 1989-90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (garticularly Lemomandia chauvini) and invertebrates (e.g., Corbudy, Pecten, Chiradoto) (C. Duffy pers. obs.). C. variopedatus builds and lives permanently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft substrate with both ends protruding like little chimneys. The worm itself is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimeres long. The anterior end is short and has bristle-bearing segments and a shovel-like mouth. The middle section bears parapodia. On the 12th segment these are modified into long wing-like structures, which secrete mucus and form a bag. The parapodia on segment 13, 14 and 15 are fused into three paddle-shaped, piston-like structures, the purpose of which is to pump water through the tube. The water is drawn in through the anterior end and expelled through the posterior ond, passing through the fine mesh of the mucus bag is later rolled up and passed by a conveyor belt of whipping hairs in the ciliated dorsal groove to	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium) L(low)
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 Significant Site SubmARY 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Asseessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be C. variopedratus. Since about 1995, large areas of these as bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.nz/indepth/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into millions of parchment shreds that litter our beaches, decaying very slowly. Large beds of Chectopterus were observed in Grove Arm, inner Queen Charlotte Sound in 1999.90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly Lenormandia chauvini) and invertebrates (e.g. Carbula, Pecten, Chiradata ) (C. Duffy pers. obs.). C. variopedatus builds and lives permanently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft substrate with both ends protruding like little chimneys. The worm itself is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimeres long. The amentiore edit is short and has bristle-bearing segments and as shore-like mouth. The middle section bears parapodia. On the 12th segment these are modified into long wing-like structures which secrete mucus and form a bag. The parapodia on segments 10, at 13, 44 and 15 are fused into three paddle-shaped, plate dives dwhole. The posterior edwhole is top may mater through the tube. The water is drawn in through the anterior end and expelled through the posterior end passing through the fine mesh of the mucus bag where food particles get trapped. The mucus bag is later rolled up and passed by a convery role to thipping hairs in the cliated dorsal grove to the mouth where it is swallowed whole. The posterior hand role worn is segmented and tapers towards the	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium)
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic dulerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture  Existing and present survey information  3.4 ha  Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original)  Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wkipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, Jarge areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. vanipadatus</i> . Since about 1995, Jarge areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. vanipadatus</i> . Since about 1995, Jarge areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. vanipadatus</i> . Since about 1995, Jarge areas of the sea bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.searlinds.org.nz/indepth/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into millions of parchment shreds that litter our beaches, decaying very isdowl, Large beds of <i>Chaetopterus</i> were observed in Grove Arm, incer Queen Charlotte Sound in 1999-90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly <i>Lenormandia chauvini</i> ) and invertebrates (e.g. <i>Carbula, Pecten, Chiradata</i> ) (C. Duffy pers. obs.). <i>C. variopedatus</i> builds and lives permanently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft substrate with both ends protruding like little chimneys. The worm itself is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimeres long. The anterior end is short and has bristle-bearing segments and a shove! like mouth. The middle action bears parpodia. On the 12th segment these are modified into long wing-like structures, which secret mucus and from a bag. The parapodia on segments 13, 14 and 15 are fused into three paddle-shaped, piston-like structures, the purpose of which is to pump water through the tube. The water is drawn in through the anterior end ad expelled through the posterior end, passing through the fine mesh of the mucus bag where food particles get trap	3.4ha Assessment critería scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium) L(low)
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture  Existing and present survey information  3.4 ha  Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original)  Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wkipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of the seal bed covered in parchment-like tubes (Inter/Interior education) and the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wkipedia, 2018). Since about 1995, large areas of the seal bed covered in parchment-like tubes (Inter/Invession, ang/Indept/Invision, Inth). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into millions of parchment shreds that litter our beaches, decaying very stowy. Large beds of Chaetopterus were observed in Grove Arm, inner Queen Charlotte Sound in 1989-90, and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (garticularly Lemomandia chauvini) and invertebrates (e.g., Corbudy, Pecten, Chiradoto) (C. Duffy pers. obs.). C. variopedatus builds and lives permanently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft substrate with both ends protruding like little chimneys. The worm itself is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimeres long. The anterior end is short and has bristle-bearing segments and a shovel-like mouth. The middle section bears parapodia. On the 12th segment these are modified into long wing-like structures, which secrete mucus and form a bag. The parapodia on segment 13, 14 and 15 are fused into three paddle-shaped, piston-like structures, the purpose of which is to pump water through the tube. The water is drawn in through the anterior end and expelled through the posterior ond, passing through the fine mesh of the mucus bag is later rolled up and passed by a conveyor belt of whipping hairs in the ciliated dorsal groove to	3.4ha Assessment critería scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium) L(low)
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic dulerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipeirs peoted about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be <i>C. variopedus</i> . Since about 1995, divers reported up by storms, those tubes breach have been those that litter our beaches, design ever solved. Since about 1995, divers reported seeing whole areas of the sea bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.n/indeptt/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, those tubes breach into millions of parchment hires tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.n/indeptt/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, the sub ubes area of marking a showel-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.n/indeptt/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, the tubes breach into millions of parchment hires tubes and there and were colonised by a number of native seaweeds (particularly <i>Lenormandia chauvini</i> ) and invertebrates (e.g. <i>Carbula, Pecten, Chiradota</i> ) (C. Duffy pers. obs.). C. variopedrus builds and lives permanently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft substrate with both ends protruding like little chimenes, the structures which secrete mucua and from a bags. The parapodia. On the 12th segment these are modified into long wing illes structures, the purpose of which is to pump water through the tube. The water is drawn in through the anterior end and expelled through the posterior end, passing through the fine mesh of the mucus bag where food particles get traped. The mucus bags is later rolled up and passed by a convery or bet of while plays in the cillated or all goards end by a convery or bet of while plays and there and the set surges than a shovel-like up and passed by a convery or bet of w	3.4ha Assessment critería scores (present review) M (medium) L(low) M (medium) L(low) H (high) M (medium) L(low)
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 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic dulerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	Introduced or exotic species Aquaculture Existing and present survey information 3.4 ha Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Sensitive Low Assessment criteria scores (original) Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) abundant at some locations around the coastal edges. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of <i>Chaetopterus</i> littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2008). Since about 1995, large areas of the sae bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into milions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into milions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into milions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into milions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into milions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into milions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into milions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into milions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into milions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into milions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms, these tubes break into milions of parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.ni/indepti/invasion.htm). Washed up by torms, these tubes break into milions of parchment by the into up t	3.4ha Assessment criteria scores (present review) M(medium) L(low) M(medium) L(low) H(high) M(medium) L(low)

# Site 3.25 Kauauroa coast (subtidal eelgrass beds)

Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Site number	3.25	3.25
Site name	Kauauroa Bay coast	
Site description	This stretch of coast is located near the western entrance to Kauauroa Bay in eastern Tawhitinui Reach. The subtidal sea	
	floor shelves steeply and is swept by moderate tidal currents (Davidson et al., 2011).	
Ecological description of attributes	There is a wide variety of filter feeding organisms including biogenic habitat formers such as sponges, ascidians, and	
	hydroids present at this site. Fish, particularly spotty, are common, however, th ese biogenic communities also provide	
	habitat for juvenile blue cod (Davidson et al., 2011). This is a good example of tidally swept habitat adjacent to a stable	
	protected catchment within the Pelorus biogeographic area.	
Biogeographic area	Pelorus Sound	
Level of original information	2. Qualitative internal report 1/09/2011	
Date of original assessment		
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 (meanet)	and bepartment of conservation.	
Field work (present)	a. 0 as	7
Date	24 & 25 January 2018	
Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental	
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Laura Richards, Courtney Rayes, Tom Scott-Simmonds	
Site Characteristics		
Original area of significant site (ha)	14.9	
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	6.3	
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m)	4-35 m	
Wave Climate	Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
Methods		
Method of assessment	Drop camera (cable remote)	
	Sonar Scan	
	Photographs (handheld surface)	
Substratum (revised site)		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Cobble	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Boulder	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Fine sand	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Silt	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)		
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Bedrock	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Important species (revised site)		-
Are important species present?	Yes	1
Important species 1	Biogenic habitats	
Species status	Biogenic habitat forming	
Biogenic type (if applicable)	Low Relief biogenic (variety of species)	
Human Impacts	connector biogenie (narrety or species)	
Damage and or impacts noted	None	
Proportion of significant site effected	None	
Level of impact		
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 of activity observed Type of damage or activity observed		
The or downed or activity observed		
SIGNIFICANT SITE SUMMARY	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Original area of significant site (ha)	14.9	14.9
Original area of significant site (ha) Recommended area of significant site (ha)	6.3	14.9 6.3
Change to original site	Decrease	Decrease
Change (ba)	86	86
Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%)	8.6 57.7%	8.6 57.7%
reitentage tildinge i toin onginal area (%)	51.170	57.776
Anthropogenic disturbance	low	
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity	Low Sensitive	
Anthropogenic vulnerability	Low-moderate	
Anthropogenic vulnerability	Low-moderate	
Assessment criteria scores	Assessment criteria scores (original)	Assessment criteria scores (present review)
1. Representativeness	Assessment criteria scores (original) M (medium)	M (medium)
2. Rarity	L (low)	L (low)
3. Diversity	L (low) H (high)	L (low) M (medium)
4. Distinctiveness	H (nigh) M (medium)	M (medium) M (medium)
4. Distinctiveness 5. Size	L (low)	M (medium) M (medium)
	L (IOW)	H (high)
		1.(1.161)
6. Connectivity		810
6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	M (medium)	NA Pasked as one of best in biogeographic area at present but should be reassessed when Tawero Point or
6. Connectivity	M (medium) Reduced area due to improved survey resolution. Biogenic community present but not abundant. Biogenic species	Ranked as one of best in biogeographic area at present but should be reassessed when Tawero Point or
6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	M (medium)	Ranked as one of best in biogeographic area at present but should be reassessed when Tawero Point or other sites in Pelorus are surveyed. This type of habitat on rocky substratum is likely to be present
6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	M (medium) Reduced area due to improved survey resolution. Biogenic community present but not abundant. Biogenic species	Ranked as one of best in biogeographic area at present but should be reassessed when Tawero Point or other sites in Pelorus are surveyed. This type of habitat on nocky substratum is likely to be present along Waitat Beach coastlines exposed to currents. High connectivity due to proximity and strong
6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	M (medium) Reduced area due to improved survey resolution. Biogenic community present but not abundant. Biogenic species	Ranked as one of best in biogeographic area at present but should be reassessed when Tawero Point or other sites in Pelorus are surveyed. This type of habitat on rocky substratum is likely to be present

# Site 3.26 Ouokaha Island

Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment
Site number	3.26	3.26
Site name	Ouokaha Island Ouokaha Island is an approximately 4.02 ha island located at the southern tip of Hopai Peninsula, Crail Bay. The significant site is located along	
Site description	the western side and the channel between the island and Hopai Peninsula.	
Ecological description of attributes	Hay (1990) stated " From the low water mark to about 3 metres depth there is a fairly thick band of seaweed comprising Cystophora torulosa ,	
	C. retroflexa, Carpophyllum flexuosum and Sargassum sinclairii. Occasionally there are small clumps of Hormosira - an unusual feature since	
	the plant is usually confined to the intertidal zone.	
	Sponges were recorded, especially the sulphur sponge Aplysilla sulfurea. At about 22 m depth, most of the bedrock is covered with shelly	
	debris and muddy sand. This marks the upper limit of a zone of horse mussels, Atrina zelandica, which extends to 27 m depth. Below this	
	depth there is a thick, gooey mud with a few burrows and dead shells.	
	The horse mussels support a rich epibiota of sponges, chitons, window oysters, fan shells and brachiopods. The ribbed, red brachiopod,	
	Terebratella sanguinea, is very abundant below 17 m depth, and is free living on shell fragments or pieces of polychaete worm tube and dead	
	brachiopod valves. Near the southwestern end of the peninsula, especially, there are large, brittle mounds of colonies of the tubeworm	
	Galeolaria hystrix .	
	Scallops were found sporadically below about 15 m depth. The large starfish, Coscinasterias, is also common at this depth and was observed	
	feeding on juvenile Atrina as well as a variety of bivalves. Fish seen included the spotty, triplefin, blue cod, kahawhai, stargazer and eagle rays.	
	During the present study (2018) large tubeworm mounds ( <i>Galeolaria hystrix</i> ) were detected on the sonar and confirmed by drop camera images. Mounds were not sufficiently abundant to form a tubeworm zone, however, the site represents one of the best examples of and area	
	supporting <i>Galeolaria</i> tubeworm mounds in Pelorus Sound. The presence of horse mussels as described by Hay (1990) was not detected."	
Biogeographic area	Pelorus Sound	
Level of original information	2. Qualitative internal report	
Date of original assessment	01/09/2011	
Report	Hay, C.H. 1990. The hydrography and benthic marine biota of Crail Bay, Pelorus Sound: A general account. Unpublished report prepared for NZ	
	Resort & Condominium Development Ltd. Held by Marlborough District Council technical library number: L001241	
Field work (present)		
Date	24 January 2018	
Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental	
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Laura Richards, Courtney Rayes, Tom Scott-Simmonds	
Site Characteristics		
Original area of significant site (ha)		
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	6.5	
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)	
Depth range (m)	0-30 m	
Wave Climate	Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)	
Methods		
Method of assessment	Drop camera (cable remote)	
	HD video (handheld surface)	
	Sonar Scan Observations	
Substratum (revised site)		
Substratum (revised site) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	Cobble	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)	COURE	
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		
Substrata (wheespread and dominant >50% cover)	Boulder	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Silt	
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Fine sand	
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell	
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead broken shell	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Bedrock	
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Substrata (localised patch or patches)		
Important species (revised site)		
Are important species present?	Yes	
Are important species present? Important species 1	Galeolaria hystrix mounds	
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status	Galeolaria hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming	
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable)	Galeolaria hystrix mounds	
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts	Galeolaria hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix)	
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted	Goleolaria hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds	
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected	Calebrainia hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10%	
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted	Galeolaria hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were	
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact	Calebraine hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds.	
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected	Galeolaria hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were	
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact	Galeolaria hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds. Anchor damage or marks on benthos	Evoert panel assessment
Are important species present? Important species 1 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	Calebraine hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds.	Expert panel assessment
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 are of significant site (ha)	Galeolaria hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds. Anchor damage or marks on benthos	Expert panel assessment
Are important species present? Important species 1 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	Cabeloriar hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds <10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds. Anchor damage or marks on benthos Existing and present survey information	
Are important species present? Important species 1 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)	Calebraine hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds. Anchor damage or marks on benthos Existing and present survey information 6.5 Increase 6.5	6.5 6.5 6.5
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) <b>Human Impacts</b> 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)	Cabelorizer hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds. Anchor damage or marks on benthos Existing and present survey information 6.5 Increase	6.5 Increase
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 (%)	Calebolizeria hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         <10%	6.5 6.5 6.5
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact 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	Calebraine hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds. Anchor damage or marks on benthos Existing and present survey information 6.5 Increase 6.5 100.0% Moderate	6.5 6.5 6.5
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 s	Caleboraria hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         < 10%	6.5 6.5 6.5
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) Human Impacts Damage and or impacts noted Proportion of significant site effected Level of impact 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	Calebraine hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds. Anchor damage or marks on benthos Existing and present survey information 6.5 Increase 6.5 100.0% Moderate	6.5 6.5 6.5
Are important species present? Important species 1 Species status Biogenic type (if applicable) <b>Human Impacts</b> 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic vulnerability	Caleboardine hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. 6. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         <10%	6.5 increase 6.5 100.0%
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 s	Caleboraria hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         < 10%	6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review)
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness	Caleboardine hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. 6. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         <10%	6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high)
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 s	Caleboardine hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. 6. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         <10%	6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium)
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 (ha) Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness	Caleboardine hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. 6. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         <10%	6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high)
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 s	Caleboardine hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. 6. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         <10%	6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium)
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic disturbances Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic disturbances Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic disturbances Species/habitats sensitivity Anthropgenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity	Caleboardine hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. 6. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         <10%	6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium)
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 original area (%) Anthropgenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Calebraine hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds. Anchor damage or marks on benthos Existing and present survey information 6.5 Increase 6.5 100.0% Moderate Extremely sensitive High Assessment criteria scores (original)	6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low)
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropsenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropsenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropsenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropsenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity	Caleboarie hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds. Anchor damage or marks on benthos Existing and present survey information 6.5 Increase 6.5 100.0% Moderate Extermely sensitive High Assessment criteria scores (original) New site. Presence of large <i>Goleolaria</i> mounds. Mounds are large and although not abundant are common along the inshore areas of this coast.	6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) L (low)
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 (%) Anthropgenic disturbance Species/habits tensitivity Anthropgenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Caleboardine hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. 6. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         <10%	6.5 increase 6.5 (Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (lo
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 (%) Anthropgenic disturbance Species/habits tensitivity Anthropgenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Caleboarie hystrix mounds Biogenic habitat forming Tubeworm mounds (e.g. G. hystrix) Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds < 10% One damaged mound was observed from drop camera imagery. This was probably damaged by a recreational fishers anchor. Two vessels were observed fishing around the island during the present survey. Divers observed several damaged mounds. Anchor damage or marks on benthos Existing and present survey information 6.5 Increase 6.5 100.0% Moderate Extermely sensitive High Assessment criteria scores (original) New site. Presence of large <i>Goleolaria</i> mounds. Mounds are large and although not abundant are common along the inshore areas of this coast.	6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L (low) L (low) The panel noted that Hay (1990) reported horse mussels from c. 17-27 m depth but considered that despite the loss of horse mussels from the site the presence of large tube worm mounds and other significant
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 (%) Anthropgenic disturbance Species/habits tensitivity Anthropgenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Caleboardine hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. 6. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         <10%	6.5 increase 6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 original area (%) Anthropgenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Caleboardine hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. 6. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         <10%	6.5 increase 6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L(low) L(low) L(low) L(low) The panel noted that Hay (1990) reported horse mussels from c. 17-27 m depth but considered that despite the loss of horse mussels from the site the presence of large tube worm mounds and other significant epifauna such as sponges and brachiopods means it retains significant usues. The reason for the loss of horse mussels from the site is the second forse the second the significant epifauna such as sponges and brachiopods means it retains significant epifauna such as sponges and brachiopods means it retains significant
Are important species present? Important species 1 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 original area (%) Anthropgenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropgenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Caleboardine hystrix mounds         Biogenic habitat forming         Tubeworm mounds (e.g. 6. hystrix)         Yes, damaged tubeworm mounds         <10%	6.5 increase 6.5 increase 6.5 100.0% Assessment criteria scores (present review) H (high) M (medium) M (medium) M (medium) H (high) L (low) L

# Site 3.27 Matai Bay tubeworms

Site Registration Datail (original)	Fuisting and account guards information	Even at some accessment			
Site Registration Detail (original) Site number	Existing and present survey information 3.27	Expert panel assessment 3.27			
Site name Site description	Matai Bay tubeworms Matai Bay (Godsiff Bay) I slocated within Tennyson Inlet (western end of Tawhitinui Reach), 22 km north of Havelock. The Inlet is well separated from the rest of the Sounds due to its geographic location, as a result water residency time are likely to be some of the longest in the Sounds. There is a relatively low variety of subtidal habitats and species compared to other areas in the Mariborough Sounds (Davidson <i>et al.</i> , 2011).				
Ecological description of attributes	The tubeworm bed discovered during the present survey of Tennyson Inlet supports high numbers of <i>Bispiro bispiro</i> SpA. This species has only been recorded from Blow Hole Point, Pelorus Sound, the northern shore of Waikawa Bay, Wellington Harbour, Whangarei Harbour, Mount Manganui, Houbra Harbour in Northland (Geoff Read, NIWA, pers.comm.). More recently, dense beds of this tubeworm have been described from a small site in Bobs Bay (0.363 ha) in Picton Harbour (Davidson <i>et al.</i> , 2011), and a very small site in Port Underwood (author pers. obs.). The site in Matai Bay is the third known and largest site (2.23 ha) in the Sounds and the only known site in Pelorus Sound that supports sufficient numbers of this species to form a bed.				
Biogeographic area	Pelorus Sound				
Level of original information Date of original assessment	2. Qualitative internal report 1/09/2011				
Report	Davidson R. J; Duffy C.A.J; Gaze P.; Baxter, A.; DuFresne S.; Courtney S.; Hamili P. 2011. Ecologically significant marine sites in Mariborough, New Zealand. Co-ordinated by Davidson environmental limited for Mariborough District Council and Department of Conservation.				
Field work (present)		_			
Date Lead organisation	17-18 March 2018 Davidson Environmental				
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Courtney Rayes, Tom Scott-Simmonds				
Site Characteristics	T	1			
Original area of significant site (ha) Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	2.232				
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)				
Depth range (m) Wave Climate	3-12 m Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)				
Methods		4			
Method of assessment	Drop camera (cable remote)				
	HD photographs (remote underwater) HD video (remote underwater) Sonar Scan				
Substratum (revised site) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)		1			
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)	Silt				
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)					
Substrata (minor <30%) Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell 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	Bispira bispira Sp.A Data deficient				
Biogenic type (if applicable)	Tubeworm non-mounds (e.g. Owenia)				
Human Impacts					
Damage and or impacts noted	Exotic species. Introduced tubeworms (Chaetopterus) common an some locations around coastal edges.				
Proportion of significant site effected	< 10%				
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	Patchy Introduced or exotic species				
Type of damage or activity observed	Sedimentation				
Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed					
Type of damage of 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)	2.232	2.232			
Change to original site					
Change (ha) Percentage change from original area (%)					
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity	Low Extremely sensitive				
Anthropogenic vulnerability	High				
Assessment criteria scores	Assessment criteria scores (original)	Assessment criteria scores (present review)			
1. Representativeness		H (high)			
2. Rarity 3. Diversity		H (high) M (medium)			
4. Distinctiveness		H (high)			
5. Size 6. Connectivity		H (high) L (low)			
7. Catchment		H (high)			
Comments	Exotic tubeworm (Chaetopteridea) is present in Tennyson Inlet. It is unknown if this species will have an impact on Bisprira beds. In New Zealand there have been many recent reports of the parchment-like tubes of Chaetopterus littering beaches, especially after storms (Wikipedia, 2018).	One of a small number of beds in the Sounds. Matai Bay bed is the largest known bed in the Sounds.			
	Since about 1995, large areas of shallow sea have been invaded by the worm, believed to be C. variopedatus. Since about 1995, divers reported				
	seeing whole areas of the sea bed covered in parchment-like tubes (http://www.seafriends.org.nz/indepth/invasion.htm). Washed up by storms,				
	these tubes break into millions of parchment shreds that litter our beaches, decaying very slowly.				
	C. variopedatus builds and lives permanently in a tough, flexible, papery U-shaped tube buried in soft substrate with both ends protruding like				
	little chimneys. The worm itself is segmented, pale coloured and up to twenty-five centimetres long. The anterior end is short and has bristle- bearing segments and a shovel-like mouth. The middle section bears parapodia. On the 12th segment these are modified into long wing-like				
	structures which secrete mucus and form a bag. The parapodia on segments 13, 14 and 15 are fused into three paddle-shaped, piston-like				
	structures, the purpose of which is to pump water through the tube. The water is drawn in through the anterior end and expelled through the posterior end, passing through the fine mesh of the mucus bag where food particles get trapped. The mucus bag is later rolled up and passed by a				
	conveyor belt of whipping hairs in the ciliated dorsal groove to the mouth where it is swallowed whole. The posterior half of the worm is				
	segmented and tapers towards the rear, bearing appendages on each segment.				
Recommendations	Create new site. It is recommended that this site remain as a significant marine site, but should be reassessed if the status for this species changes to introduced or invasive. Species status at present = cryptogenic.	Accept site. Reaccess if shown to be exotic species.			
REFERENCES	Nelson, W.A.; Knight, G.A. 1995. Asperococcus bullosus - A new record for northern New Zealand of an adventive marine brown alga. Tane, Vol. 35,				
	PP 121-125. 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 programme. Summary 2014-2015. Frepared by DavidSon Environmental Limited for Marlborough District Council. Survey and monitoring report number 819.				

# Ste 3.28 Penzance Bay (elephantfish spawning)

Site Registration Datail (original)	Pulation and an and an and an address	P		
Site Registration Detail (original) Site number	Existing and present survey information 3.28	Expert panel assessment 3.28		
Site name	3.28 Penzance Bay (elephantfish spawning)			
Site description	Penzance Bay is located along the northern shores of Tennyson Inlet. The Bay supports a small settlement of mostly holiday homes, a jetty			
	and launching ramp. The site is located inside the larger Tennyson Inlet significant site (Davidson et al., 2011).			
Ecological description of attributes	Tennyson Inlet is recognised as the largest bay complex in the Marlborough Sounds surrounded by stable and protected native forest			
	catchments (Davidson et al., 2011).			
Biogeographic area	Pelorus Sound			
Level of original information	2. Qualitative internal report			
Date of original assessment	1/09/2011 Devideor B. L. Duffu C. A. L. Coro, B. J. Bautor, A. Du Freeno, S. Courteou, S. Hamill D. 2011. Ecologically significant marine sites in Mechanoush			
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	17-18 March 2018			
Lead organisation	Davidson Environmental			
Personnel	Rob Davidson, Courtney Rayes, Tom Scott-Simmonds	1		
Site Characteristics	1	1		
Original area of significant site (ha) Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	6.68			
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)			
Depth range (m)	7-11 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) Sonar Scan			
Substratum (revised site)		1		
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)				
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)	Silt			
Substrata (common 30-50% cover) Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell			
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead broken shell			
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Bedrock			
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Boulder			
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Cobble			
Important species (revised site)				
Are important species present?	Yes			
Important species 1 Species status	Elephantfish spawning Conservation/scientific importance			
Biogenic type (if applicable)				
Human Impacts	1			
Damage and or impacts noted	Fine sediment present, moorings may disturb egg cases, moorings restrict recreational dredging.	1		
Proportion of significant site effected	75-100%			
Level of impact	Unknown			
Type of damage or activity observed	Sedimentation			
Type of damage or activity observed Type of damage or activity observed	Moorings			
Type of damage of 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)	6.68	6.68		
Change to original site Change (ha)				
Percentage change from original area (%)				
Anthropogenic disturbance	Moderate			
Species/habitat sensitivity	Unknown			
Anthropogenic vulnerability	Low-moderate			
Assessment criteria scores	Assessment criteria scores (original)	Assessment criteria scores (present review)		
1. Representativeness		M (medium)		
2. Rarity		M (medium)		
3. Diversity		L (low)		
4. Distinctiveness 5. Size		M (medium)		
5. Size 6. Connectivity		L (low) M (medium)		
7. Catchment		M (medium)		
Comments	Highest numbes of egg cases observed during 2008 survey year.			
Recommendations	Create new site. Monitor elephantfish egg case densities. Implement low impact moorings where they overlap with spawning habitat.			
DEFEDENCES	Nelson, W.A.; Knight, G.A. 1995. Asperococcus bullosus - A new record for northern New Zealand of an adventive marine brown alga. Tane,	Hurst, R.J.; Stevenson, M.L.; Bagley, N.W.; Griggs, L.H.; Morrison, M.A.;		
REFERENCES	Vol. 35, PP 121-125.	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 ENV 1999/03		
		Objective 1.		
	Francis, M.P. 1997. Spatial and temporal variation in the growth rate of elephantfish (Callorhinchus milii). New Zealand Journal of Marine and			
		2016. Conservation status of New Zealand chondrichthyans (chimaeras, sharks and rays), 2016. New Zealand Threat Classification Series.		
		Sharks and rays), 2016. New Zealand Threat Classification Series. Department of Conservation.		
	Didier, D. A. 1995: Phylogenetic systematics of extant chimaeroid fishes (Holocephali, Chimaeroidei). American Museum novitates 3119. 86			
	p			
	p. Didier, D.A. 1993. The chimaeroid fishes: a taxonomic review with notes on their general biology. Chrondros 4(5).			

# Ste 3.29 Treble Tree coast (current swept)

Site Registration Detail (original)	Existing and present survey information	Expert panel assessment				
Site Registration Detail (original) Site number	Existing and hissent znizek intoluation	Expert panel assessment				
Site name	Treble Tree coastline					
Site description	The Treble Tree coastline is located along the western shores of Waitata Reach immediately south of Waitata Bay.					
Ecological description of attributes	The Treble Tree coast had three 3 ha research marine farms installed in 1997. The research farms are in a moderate to strong tidal					
	Ine repeir trepie trepie trepie that there is an essential many interval in the research names are in a moderate to strong total flow environment and have been only used for sponge research and juvenile mussle spat experiments. These experiments have the research of the research of the research and juvenile mussle spat experiments. These experiments have the research of the re					
	not impacted the seabed (Battershill, 1999), however their presence over a period of 20 years has excluded the sites from scallop					
	dredging. In contrast, adjacent soft bottom shores in Waitata Reach have been intensively dredged during the scallop season. The					
	Treble Tree coast therefore represents a shore in a state of advanced recovery and heading towards the pre-dredge state.					
	DuFresne and Richards (2006) recommended that the three research marine farm sites be relocated further from shore to avoid					
	benthic habitats. These habitats were mostly soft bottom biogenic communities. Since that time another 12 years have passed allowing further recovery of the benthos.					
	anowing to the recovery of the benthos.					
Biogeographic area Level of original information	Pelorus Sound 2. Qualitative internal report					
Date of original assessment						
Report	DuFresne, S; Richards, L 2006. Benthic survey of three proposed marine farm renewals located north of Treble Tree Point, Pelorus					
	Sound. Prepared for Treble Tree Holdings Ltd by DuFresne Ecology Ltd.					
Field work (present)		-				
Date						
Lead organisation Personnel						
Site Characteristics		J				
Original area of significant site (ha)		1				
Suggested revision of significant site (ha)	32.57					
Marine zone	Sublittoral (low tide to continental shelf)					
Depth range (m)	0-38 m					
Wave Climate	Sheltered coast (enclosed or semi-enclosed water body)					
Methods		1				
Method of assessment	Drop camera (cable remote) HD photographs (remote underwater)					
	HD video (remote underwater)					
	Sonar Scan					
Substratum (revised site)						
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)						
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover)						
Substrata (widespread and dominant >50% cover) Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Fine sand					
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Silt					
Substrata (common 30-50% cover)	Shell hash					
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead whole shell					
Substrata (minor <30%)	Dead broken shell					
Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Bedrock					
Substrata (localised patch or patches) Substrata (localised patch or patches)	Boulder Cobble					
Important species (revised site)						
Are important species present?	Yes	]				
Important species 1	Biogenic communities					
Species status	Biogenic habitat forming					
Biogenic type (if applicable)	Diversed adults and investiga					
Important species 2 Species status	Blue cod adults and juveniles Iconic					
Biogenic type (if applicable)						
Human Impacts						
Damage and or impacts noted	Has been retired from dredging and trawling since 1997					
Proportion of significant site effected	75-100%					
Level of impact Type of damage or activity observed	Variable but most pronounced in shallow areas					
Type of damage of 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)	באוזעה ארכובות לאוואלא אווטווואלאטוו	LAPERT Pariet door of the second se				
Recommended area of significant site (ha)	32.57					
Change to original site						
Change (ha)						
Percentage change from original area (%)						
Percentage change from original area (%) Anthropogenic disturbance	Low					
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity	Extremely sensitive					
Anthropogenic disturbance						
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability	Extremely sensitive High	Assessment criteria scores (present review)				
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity	Extremely sensitive	Assessment criteria scores (present review)				
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores	Extremely sensitive High	Assessment criteria scores (present review)				
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity	Extremely sensitive High	Assessment criteria scores (present review)				
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness	Extremely sensitive High	Assessment criteria scores (present review)				
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size	Extremely sensitive High	Assessment criteria scores (present review)				
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness	Extremely sensitive High	Assessment criteria scores (present review)				
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity	Extremely sensitive High	May be the largest shallow soft bottom habitat not dredged in recent years				
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	Extremely sensitive High Assessment criteria scores (original)	May be the largest shallow soft bottom habitat not dredged in recent years in Waitata Reach. Insufficient information at present.				
Antropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Antropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Ranty 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment	Extremely sensitive High	May be the largest shallow soft bottom habitat not dredged in recent years				
Anthropogenic disturbance Species/habitat sensitivity Anthropogenic vulnerability Assessment criteria scores 1. Representativeness 2. Rarity 3. Diversity 4. Distinctiveness 5. Size 6. Connectivity 7. Catchment Comments	Extremely sensitive High Assessment criteria scores (original)	May be the largest shallow soft bottom habitat not dredged in recent years in Waitata Reach. Insufficient information at present.				

# 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. Site 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). 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).

For example, 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". 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 predatory target species.

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 and data. Davidson *et al.* (2017a) reported that some sites were adversely affected by anthropogenic activities. In the most recent study, Davidson *et al.* (2018) reported many sites were reduced in size due to improvements in survey detail, while others were affected by physical disturbance, exotic species and increased sedimentation.

#### 6.2 Threat assessment process

The Expert Panel assessed anthropogenic threats for each significant site (Table 3) based on:

- The perceived level of anthropogenic disturbance (e.g. dredging recorded).
- Species, community or habitat vulnerability to anthropogenic impact (e.g. fragile species).
- Significant site vulnerability to anthropogenic impact (e.g. site located on an offshore soft bottom or site located next to rocky reef).

This assessment was 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).

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 assessment 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).

**Anthropogenic vulnerability** is an assessment of the vulnerability of a habitat, species and/or community to human-derived damage because of its location or the level of physical or legal protection. For example, a very shallow community is regarded as having a low vulnerability to damage from dredging and trawling, while a marine reserve has a high level of legal protection from marine-based anthropogenic impacts.

#### Table 3. Selected environmental categories used to assess threat.

Categories	Descriptions, definitions and examples
Anthropogenic disturbance	
Low	Little or no known human associated physical disturbance. Catchment effects low (vegetated).
Moderate	Light equipment and/or anchoring disturbance. Well managed catchment.
High	Subjected to regular or heavy equipment seabed disturbance, and/or catchments modified and poorly managed.
Sensitivity (species, habitat)	
Resilient (low or unlikely)	Algae forest, coarse mobile substrata, reef, boulder bank, high energy shore, short-lived species.
Sensitive (moderate)	Horse mussels, soft tubeworms, shellfish beds, red algae bed.
Very sensitive (high)	Massive bryozoans, sponges, hydroids, burrowing anemone.
Extremely sensitive (very high)	Lace or fragile bryozoan colonies, tubeworm mounds, rhodoliths.
Anthropogenic vulnerability	
Low	Legally or physically protected e.g. in a reserve, on rocky substrata, on a steep slope.
Moderate	Limited or difficult access e.g. close to rocks, shallow, close to shore. Limited or no legal protection.
High	Location easily accessed, no legal protection e.g. offshore soft bottom substratum.

## 6.3 Threat assessment summary

Of the three categories, anthropogenic disturbance is likely to be the most important consideration for the continued viability of a significant site. Any score above "low" indicates human activities are having an impact and management action is required to ensure continuation of natural values at the site. Four sites were scored "moderate" and one site scored a "high" for anthropogenic disturbance. When this score is combined with a species community or habitat in the "extremely sensitive" category and a "high" score for anthropogenic vulnerability, the issue becomes critical (e.g. disturbance occurring at a vulnerable site that supports a sensitive habitat, community or species).

#### Site 3.22 Tawhitinui Bay king shag colony:

King shags are most vulnerable at their breeding colonies. Their nervous nature makes them particularly vulnerable to disturbance potentially leading to chick and egg mortalities. At present there is no restriction on how close boats can approach a colony. It is strongly recommended that the colonies have a minimum 50 m no-approach zone. This recommendation could be implemented through the adoption of a voluntary code of conduct by commercial vessel operators and other sectors in the Sounds. A public awareness campaign is also suggested.

#### Site 3.26 Ouokaha Island (tubeworm mounds)

The western side of Ouokaha Island supports the best example of *Galeolaria* tubeworm mounds in Pelorus Sound. *Galeolaria* tubeworm beds are known from only 18.2 ha or 0.003% of the Sounds marine area. Ouokaha Island is 6.5 ha in size and supports low density mounds. Davidson *et al.* (2018) documented damage from recreation fisher anchors and chains. This site will likely continue to be reduced in quality unless anchoring is excluded.

#### Site 3.28 Penzance Bay elephantfish spawning

High numbers of elephantfish egg cases were observed in a new significant site located in Penzance Bay. Moorings are numerous in the bay and act to exclude recreational dredging; however, traditional block and chain moorings likely disturb egg cases. It is therefore recommended that moorings be converted to low impact systems.

#### Site 3.8 Fitzroy Bay elephantfish spawning

A variety of human activities occur in the Fitzroy Bay elephantfish spawning site. A small number of mussel farms overlap with this site and have altered the benthic habitat. It is recommended that these marine farms be surveyed, and growing structures removed where they overlap with spawning habitat. Marine farm anchors and warps have been shown to have little impact on the benthos (Davidson and Richards, 2014) and need not be removed. Moorings also exist in one area of this site. Again, low impact moorings are suggested.

#### Site 3.23 Woodlands (west) rhodoliths

This new significant site supports the smallest known rhodolith bed in the Sounds. It is physically protected from commercial dredging by the adjacent headland and marine farm. Although anchor blocks have dragged through the bed in the past, this is unlikely to occur in the future.

The Expert Panel recommends that all sites regarded as sensitive or vulnerable to anthropogenic disturbance (Table 4) be given a level of protection that ensures their biological values are not further degraded. In some cases, this would mean the highest level of protection e.g. no anchoring.

# 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: Swap Site 2.29 Witt Rock with Site 2.28 MacManaway Rocks on Map 7

#### Page 91 Map 15

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

# 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 Steve Urlich (MDC).

Sites	Anthropogenic disturbance	Sensitivity (species, habitat)	Anthropogenic vulnerability	Major issues	Comments
Site 3.7 Picnic Bay rhodoliths	Low	Extremely sensitive	Moderate	Adjacent forest logging	No impact observed, fragile species, physical protection from marine farm & headland, open to dredging
Site 3.8 Fitzroy Bay elephantfish spawning	Moderate to high	Unknown	Moderate to high	Decline in abundance	Habitat impacted by marine farms, sediment and exotic species, egg case sensitivity not known, no commercial dredging & trawling
Site 3.9 Tennyson Inlet	Low	Sensitive	Low-moderate	Forestry, exotic marine species	Low levels of human impact, stable catchments, habitats wilnerable to increased sedimentation, no commercial dredging & trawling
Site 3.11 Tapapa coastline	Low	Sensitive	Low-moderate		Some damage to biogenic habitats from anchoring by recreational fishers likely. Dredging and trawling unlikely.
Site 3.12 Piripaua Reef	Low	Sensitive	Low		Reef habitat, small risk of anchor damage, tubeworm mounds may be present
Site 3.15 Grant Bay Reef	Low	Sensitive	Low		Reef habitat, small risk of anchor damage, tubeworm mounds may be present
Site 3.22 Tawhitinui Bay king shag colony	Moderate	Extremely sensitive	High	Mortalities from disturbance	Colony vulnerable to disturbance, recreational fisher disturbance occurs
Site 3.23 Woodlands (west) rhodoliths	Moderate	Extremely sensitive	Moderate	Adjacent forest logging	Impact from anchor drag, fragile species, physical protection from marine farm & headland, open to dredging
Site 3.24 Tuhitarata Bay Reef	Low	Sensitive	Low		Reef habitat, small risk of anchor damage, tubeworm mounds may be present
Site 3.25 Kauauroa coast	Low	Sensitive	Low-moderate		Some damage to biogenic habitats from anchoring by recreational fishers likely. Dredging and trawling unlikely.
Site 3.26 Ouokaha Island (west coast)	Moderate	Extremely sensitive	High	Recreational anchoring	Recreational fishers regularly anchor and damage tubeworm mounds
Site 3.27 Matai Bay tubeworms	Low	Extremely sensitive	Moderate		No impact observed, fragile species, closed to commercial dredging
Site 3.28 Penzance Bay elephantfish spawning	Moderate	Unknown	Low-moderate		Moorings present (impact on egg cases unkonwn)
Site 3.29 Treble Tree coastline	Low	Extremely sensitive	High	Physical damage	Soft bottom current swept community where commercial has been dredging excluded

# Table 4. Summary of anthropogenic disturbance and vulnerability assessment.

#### References

- Airoldi L, Balata D, Beck MW. 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.
- 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. 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). Estaurine 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
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 a sites significance. Site that do not achieve "H" or "M" are 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).