

Taupō hui - 26 June 2019

NB: These meeting notes record the verbal comments of meeting attendees. The comments were not fact-checked before being recorded here. The comments do not represent the views of the review team or the Ministry for Primary Industries.

- Protection is what's on mind rather than tracks.
- We want to put a footprint in to safeguard sites, whether wāhi tapu or not.
- What Māori need to be doing is putting own plan together to say what we want. We are working with DOC.
- Mostly we get DOC land back. There are problems with the way we've had to assume these. Walking Access Commission (WAC) has nothing to do with this – it is about creating access on land of choosing without having to do that.
- The WAC can also help you with getting access over private land. WAC can be good advocates to help; broker with these agencies, and help us manage and control land we've got back.
- Iwi: The Act is irrelevant in this day and age. We can use WAC but we have other mechanisms to engage.
- Now what we have is not ideal – people of NZ are angry and have sense of entitlement, unlike people who carry the Walking Access Act.
- Hapū are not respected. New Zealanders look at Māori land as public land. Their land is private. Māori are portrayed as angry and complaining when they dare to complain about something that happens to entrance ways and sacred places. Hapū are complaining. Other users have said to tell us where they can't go. We've refused and said, no we will tell you where you can go. This continues to be place of tension and friction. No matter how set things up, people will find way to stuff up. When it comes to Māori, these users do it with a sense of entitlement which is unbelievable, for example against aunties who have to combat aggressive people. People intrude, take no notice of anything, not even highest of ideals. Our whānau on land are inexperienced with dealing with this.
- The iwi has an Act that acknowledges mana of hapū and that decisions need to be made by them, and that they will be kaitiaki and provide manaakitanga for those who respect the rights of kai.
- The iwi's settlement act has instruments:
 - Te Kōpua Kānapanapa ... tripartite committee – Te Kotahitanga plus councils – Te Kotahitanga is a monthly meeting of 26 hapū and their reps).
 - Te Piringa – new partnership with DOC. Management and co governance of DOC estate.
- Implications for walking access – if there's walking access over the land, whether private or DOC, it comes back to the authority of the iwi.
- Our concern is about protecting, not so much development, and access that is not properly monitored, or does not have facilities in place. We can give examples of bad behaviours, no good ones. For example, we create a formal way, and visitors will use informal way, to walk or hunt...they don't care whose land it's on. The moment you put up signs for Māori land, you get them shot at or people use battery operated cutters to cut down signs that cost a lot. If you create something, you're responsible for it, and purpose is maintained but it does create an outlet for bad behaviour. This is why access is important.
- There are cultural redress properties that have public access.
- Is WAC able to review these at some time?

- WAC: It depends on the nature of the arrangement as to whether WAC can do anything. The Commission may be able to affect this, but if it is DOC land, it is beyond WAC's authority.
- Iwi: We would get pushback if tried to close.
- Leith Comer (Review Panel member): the iwi's partnership is a blueprint for all others.
- Iwi: Example, of death on maunga crater – put up sign which was shot to bits, then gates super glued. Have SO MANY bad experiences, why would we want to create more?
- WAC can be useful as advocates to find a practical way to satisfy requirements.
- Iwi: got no problem with what WAC does – if the Regional Field Officer (RFA) works directly with the iwi, don't need an Act – the iwi are the decision makers. For example, the RFA works with head of the environmental department with a plan and have direct engagement.
- The Act is from a time ten years ago that has changed dramatically. In Treaty settlements – focus never on quantum or material things – primarily was on roe not fish i.e. agreements to leverage as much tino rangatiratanga as possible. Mana whenua and mana hapū make at-place decisions. WAC deliberately made a walkway right to the boundary. Instead talks would have said where to put the walkway where it didn't risk the land.
- Starting and end point is, 'we will determine what access looks like', but we will respond to what specific things look like in the Act. WAC is the most objective vehicle to determine things. Good to have this vehicle, so don't abolish. That is, to help sort out some of these issues.
- Te Piringa – is iwi's co governance arrangements for all DOC lands. It will include national park in future, lands around Lake Taupō, and Kaimanawa forest. It's a massive area of land. DOC is the biggest landowner of land in natural state. The iwi has lots of land, private ownership, and freehold. A minimum of 50% is accessed by the public. We had to sign access agreements at the last hour, so we were coerced into accepting public access arrangements. The iwi has just one administering body to manage all access. Funding is possible, eg for wilding pines. The iwi is trying to organise to make sure funding is maintained and redirected to areas. There is a set DOC fund budget for each rohe, and as lands come over funds will come over. The iwi will focus on water bodies, such as riparian plantings.
- Gone past the Act now. Majority of walkers are too irresponsible to be given access - they have a sense of entitlement as opposed to good.
- The purpose should be about education, for example, how to protect water. Rather than enjoyment, appreciation. Also education about what access means. For example, the Queen's Chain gets thrown at Māori, especially about water (although rock climbing is excellent). Whānau have been worked with about how to say to people this is private land – for example, three out of five said they would not leave.
- They involved police, who claimed the Queen's Chain. After that, police said give us proof you own the land. Police need education.
- Recently we reengaged with the Alpine Club, who were cutting down trees, and swimming naked. Now have worked with the club to develop how to behave. Sense of entitlement eg my family climbed here for 30 yrs.
- There is no regional approach. Needs to be aligned and to have higher level thought, not just individual tracks. DOC needs a paradigm change – timeframes says this, no answer means yes. Majority of Māori responses get ignored.
- Give a little bit of access, which runs close to Māori land, and they use it – climbers, anglers, birdwatchers, hunters, cycling, and own whānau re hunting and gathering.
- Injury and deaths affect us. Someone can walk into bus at altitude and be in danger – it's about how people prepare themselves. We are often the ones who have to react, for

example, we spend a lot of time helping police rescue unprepared people. How can we make sure they're prepared?

- Look at commercial gain – see National Parks – people now have to pay. When users have to pay, they pay attention to the rules.
- On DOC lands, they can issue a recreation permit ...this is a payment schedule that gets ignored. Cycle groups maintain areas, then they feel entitlement.
- Put up a stop sign – will allow people to understand.
- Others eg Total sports – latch on to recreation permit and use DOC land, but not paying for closing off the track eg lots of running round the Maunga. Landowners are not getting anything. Expenses, traffic control, wharepaku, parking both sides of tracks with bus trying to get to top, kids running around.
- How far does the WAC go with free access?
- Our marae happily welcomes people. It is an intrinsic value – only a problem if there is a process that's wrong. Marae is the one that should decide.
- Just put up STOP sign – show people what it's about – education is too slow and difficult.
- Nobody is helping pay for the vista view – people need to pay. Marae can make decision themselves.
- Crown should use their land as state owned enterprise owners, eg PAMU, farm land.
- Is WAC only to be used for free? Could do for commercial.
- Doesn't include prams, wheelchairs, mobility.
- Use of mapping.
- Act doesn't contain protection. Eg need messaging such as Kauri dieback, freshwater contamination.
- Te Araroa track goes over Tongariro alpine crossing. It is of huge significance for iwi – it's a wāhi tapu, and there are 37 people buried there.
- Got 111 call for 3 travellers from UK on Tongariro with jandals, bare feet.
- People look at paper roads, but there are three roads where there is forest operation – what is the process for closing roads?
- We're not saying no to tourism – there needs to be a collaborative approach from different agencies – this can be a good contributor but can also have negative impacts, behaviours need to be addressed. We also said same to Tourism consultation. We're trying to teach people natural and cultural values, but we have difficulty with getting people to appreciate this, as well as their safety.
- When carparks get full, they park on the land, eg firebreaks. This puts a lot more onus on Māori.
- Having someone that has the understanding in the rohe is important [like Regional Field Advisors] – rather than someone from Auckland.
- WAC: there's a general public view of Māori land as public land – this needs to be addressed in society generally.