

Contact Details

Name: Mike Drake
 Postal address: P.O. Box 10, Tapawera 7055, Nelson
 Telephone number: 03 5224458
 Email: mikedrake@clear.net.nz
 Date: February 20, 2013

Details of comments

Section, policy, method	My comment	I seek the following decision
Introduction	Funding implications of DoC's role: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will DoC be funded adequately to manage this proposal? • Will funding be additional to DoC's existing budget or will this non-conservation activity be funded at the expense of genuine conservation activities? • Once it's approved, will the Minister then start looking for cost savings within the agreed plan. • Perhaps chop DoC's monitoring function, say "the concessionaires are good, honest people and will be accountable to monitor themselves. We can trust them to do this..." etc. • Cost of extracting people, vehicles in an emergency - additional aircraft, vehicles on the new road, increased numbers on/at the glacier face, idiots who get on onto the new road who should not be there. • Who pays to rescue tourists (and concessionaires)? User pays (West Coast tourism, concessionaires)? Tax payer pays? We/tax payers fund enough rescues of tourists (eg Milford Track) already. 	Ensure sufficient attention is given to this at the proposal stage.

1.3.11.1(e)	<p>Why should everyone be able to access Icon Destinations? Not everyone can climb Mt Cook, or should climb Mt Cook. Should everyone be allowed to walk the Milford Track?</p> <p>Providing access roads for concessionaires allows people with money to spoil the experience for those who do the full walk. Why should this be so? The walk at the moment spreads people out, leaving the vehicle noise behind. If the road continues for a “few” they will arrive in large batches jostling for position.</p> <p>Perhaps the concessionaires want their passengers to quickly see the glaciers so they can then be on their way. It’s all about the “conveying” tourists as fast as possible to the next “Icon Destination”.</p> <p>I strongly object to concessionaires having privileged access to the glacier faces. In going ahead with this privatisation of DOC land, we continue to erode the classless nature of the great outdoors.</p>	Provide a parking space for everyone. If the road needs to be extended then let DOC pay for this, and manage this resource.
2.1.1	<p>Why delete sections related to disturbance of walkers? This information is still highly relevant. Perhaps it is too sensitive to leave in the document. It conflicts with the commercial direction the plan is wanting to pursue.</p>	Leave these sections in the document.
<p>4.3.9.(b)</p> <p>4.3.9.(c)(ii)</p>	<p>Monitoring: Monitoring in the proposal focuses on use and users of the road, aircraft impacts, visitor monitoring.</p> <p>Who will monitor that concessionaires comply with all terms and conditions of their concessions?</p>	Ensure there is comprehensive accountability with no gaps. Implies adequate funding for DoC or perhaps an independent third party to audit.
4.4.3(b)	<p>Who decides when it is “unsafe” to access the glacier by foot?</p> <p>Increasing aircraft movements around these two “Icon Destinations” will inevitably degrade the experience for those who appreciate the peace and quiet of the outdoors.</p>	No change to the number of allowed landings.
4.4.3(b)(ii)	Changing the heli-hikes from 8 trips	No change to the number of allowed

	to 50 for both glaciers is an enormous increase.	landings.
4.4.3(f) "25% or greater of visitors on the glacier valley terminal face walks reporting annoyance with aircraft"	How is this measured? Are all the visitors asked? It appears to be an objective measure. But how is this monitored continually?	Employ a statistician to ensure that all monitoring is performed correctly.
4.4.3(f) "To address aircraft noise impacts on visitors undertaking the longer side valley walks, education and information will be provided <u>advising visitors of the presence of aircraft, rather than decreasing aircraft activity in the glacier valleys.</u> "	So the idea is to "educate" people that they will be annoyed, so that they are less likely to say "we were annoyed by the aircraft noise". They would feel stupid in saying this since they have already been advised that they will be annoyed.	No additional landings. Don't prepare visitors for noise and skew the monitoring.
Pages 21 - 23 Make amendments to Tables Five, Six and Seven to reflect the different use of landing sites resulting from changing glacier conditions, and add an additional landing site for Lame Duck Flat.	Adding additional landing sites may appear trivial. However, when a climber/tramper has been walking from dawn to dusk to get to a hut, only to find people (helicoptered) already there, it is very demoralising. Especially when the people in the hut make no accommodation for your arrival. I have had this experience at Horace Walker Hut.	No change, or reduce landings current landings..
Page 2 "On 11 August 2012, the Department notified its intention to partially review the current plan to address issues of access to the glacier valleys."	If the imperative is access to the glaciers for guided parties, why include all the additional changes when this would appear outside of the immediate requirement?	Focus on the immediate "urgent" issue and not expand the scope. Doing a partial review should be only done in extreme cases otherwise things are rushed through in a half-baked manner. The fact that there were only 24 suggestions indicates perhaps that people would rather be experiencing the outdoors than sit in front of a computer. Also, perhaps DOC need to review how it engages with the wider community, and make submissions simpler. Perhaps have a tick box approach; Do you want a private road to the glacier faces [yes/no]. Do you want an increase in flights onto the glacier [yes/no]. Leave room for people to make comments. Also, widely publicise the changes.

		I will be interested to see how many submissions there are for this partial review.
--	--	---

Hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your comments?	No
--	----

Example From A Previous Submission