

FAR WEST
MARINE PARKS LOCAL ADVISORY GROUP

MINUTES

The fourth meeting of the Far West Marine Parks Local Advisory Group was held on Monday 14 February 2011 in the Ceduna Council Chambers, 44 O'Loughlin Terrace, Ceduna at 10.30am.

We acknowledge and respect the traditional custodians whose lands we are meeting upon today. We acknowledge the deep feelings of attachment and relationship of Aboriginal peoples to country. We also pay respect to the cultural authority of Aboriginal people visiting/attending from other areas of South Australia/Australia present here.

Members present: Ian Cawood (Chair), Andrew Minns, Gus Oestmann, Reg Davis, Jonathan Hoffrichter, Allan Haseldine, Allan Suter, Perry Will, Nick Paul.

Proxies: Debbie Kloock (Simon Firth), Noel Box (Trent Gregory)

Supporting staff: Jon Emmett (DENR), Shelley Harrison (DENR), Dirk Holman (DENR), Louise Mortimer (secretary)

Gallery: 27 members of the gallery (names tabled)

1. Welcome

Ian Cawood (Chair) welcomed MPLAG and gallery members to the meeting.

Dirk Holman (Executive Officer) thanked the members for their attendance, and provided a brief overview of proceedings for the meeting. Dirk also introduced support staff and some of the information provided to the group.

2. Apologies/absent

Apologies: Jane Lowe, Simon Firth, Bruce Zippel (arrived late), Trent Gregory, Chris Catsambalis, Rob Palmer.

Absent: Nil

3. Other business

- Allan Suter raised for discussion the issue of an apology which has been requested from the Minister for Environment and Conservation for misleading comments made in regards to percentages quoted as international obligations for marine park sanctuary zones.

- The agenda was adopted with amendments made by the Chair.

4. Correspondence

A letter was tabled (and distributed to members) from Rob Palmer, providing zoning suggestions to be tabled as advice to the meeting, and requesting his objection to an action in MPLAG meeting 3 be noted.

5. Confirmation of previous minutes

The minutes of meeting held on the 22 November 2010 were signed as an accurate record by the Chair with the following amendments:

- Rob Palmer (via correspondence) requested that the minutes be changed to reflect his objection to an action arising from MPLAG meeting 3.
- Andrew Minns and Chris Catsambalis added to the 'members present' section.

Moved: Allan Suter; seconded: Gus Oestmann

5.1 Action Items and business arising from the minutes

Actions arising from meeting 3

Meeting No.	Responsibility	Action	Status	Date
3	All Members	1.2 Implement Communication Plan.	Ongoing	Next Meeting
3	DENR	DENR to clarify the government commitments to international treaties and national commitments.	Clarified	MPLAG 4
3	DENR	Provide and outline of how the impact statements will be developed.	Ongoing	
3	DENR	Advise MPLAG members of any changes to current activity and uses regulations.	Ongoing	
3	Allan Suter	To provide the letter of the government commitment to the sardine industry to Paul Watson (Gallery)	Not clarified	

5.2 Business arising from the minutes

Nil.

6. Agenda Items

6.1 Today's Meeting

Ian Cawood outlined the meeting format for the day. Ian noted that the format was considerably different from the intended agenda due to the work that the MPLAG group had done preparing prior to the meeting, and that Dirk's presentation had been shortened to reflect this work also.

The proposed sanctuary zone maps prepared by the MPLAG will be presented to the District Council of Ceduna and the community before being presented to the Minister for Environment and Conservation if they are accepted and endorsed by the community. Maps are not tabled in the minutes of this meeting, however will be publicly available once endorsed by the council and community.

6.2 Presentation: Where to from here (Dirk Holman)

Dirk's amended presentation outlined the process from here, given the work already undertaken by the MPLAG, including future meeting dates. He outlined the peak stakeholder groups that will be consulted if the proposed zoning maps are endorsed by council and community.

Action: MPLAG Meeting #5 date be changed from April to July, as it is considered too soon to effectively get feedback from council, community and peak stakeholder groups.

Moved: Allan Suter; MPLAG unanimously agreed and seconded.

6.3 Comments and Feedback from LAG Members

Allan Suter reiterated the amount of work undertaken by the MPLAG to produce the new proposed sanctuary zone maps. Also noted is that he has contacted Allan Holmes about information presented at the MPLAG meetings in regard to the information being provided by marine parks' staff but was unhappy with his response. He has since contacted the Minister for Environment and Conservation but is yet to receive a response. He believes that this is alienating people who may otherwise have supported the marine parks process. Allan is unhappy with the quality of the science being presented as evidence for positioning of the marine parks and sanctuary zones.

A motion will go to council on Wednesday (15/2/2011) seeking in principle support for the alternative maps produced by the MPLAG. This motion will also seek to authorise a public meeting to examine these proposed alternative sanctuary zone maps.

Allan emphasised that the community has already made concessions and that they will not accept any further changes to the proposed zones in the maps produced by the MPLAG.

There was a brief discussion about the *Marine Parks Act 2007* and the recent amendments to the process for approving management plans.

Jonas Woolford clarified that the maps will be presented to the public as soon as possible after council endorsement.

Allan explained how the new proposed zoning maps are presented. Members and gallery were given the opportunity to view the maps.

6.4 Habitat Protection Zones

Habitat protection zones were discussed in relation to the anchoring of vessels over 80m in length, which has potential implications for Thevenard.

6.5 GABMP (Marine Park 1)

Interaction between this MPLAG and the Great Australian Bight Marine Park (MP1) were discussed. It was suggested that the Nuyts Archipelago MPLAG had not been advised of the intention to establish state marine protected areas (MPAs) in the Great Australian Bight Marine Park (Federal) and form a relevant MPLAG.

In response, Jon Emmett pointed out that this had been discussed at MPLAG meeting 1.

6.6 Other activities in MPAs

Other activities and how they will be dealt with in MPAs and their respective management plans were discussed, including net fishing and the harvesting of razorfish.

6.7 Habitat protection zones (HPZ)

Habitat protection zones, their placement and value, and their relationship with sanctuary zones (SZ) were discussed. The relationship between the *Marine Parks Act 2007* and other Acts in relation to their use in HPZs and SZs was also discussed. Clarification from the Minister for Environment and Conservation was sought in regards to final regulations and definitions on what activities can be undertaken in each zone. The merits of undertaking separate consultation for HPZs and SZs was discussed and questioned.

7. Questions and Comments from the Gallery

Members of the gallery were offered the opportunity to ask questions or offer comments through the Chair. A summary of the questions/comments were as follows:

- Are we putting the environment 'out of whack' by removing fishing from sanctuary zones? ie; negative effects.

Marl Shippard, Ceduna – Far West

Dirk responded:

Changes within sanctuary zones have been noted in other MPAs elsewhere, including similar environments, and the majority are positive. Because our impact on the environment has been so protracted it's likely that we have little knowledge about how the environment really looked in the first place, so perceived 'negative effects' may actually represent the environment returning to a more natural balance.

- How are marine protected areas going to be policed?

Randall Bender, Ceduna – Penong

Dirk responded:

A whole of government approach will be used to police marine parks, possibly including PIRSA Fisheries, SAPOL, and DENR.

- DENR cannot manage what they have now on the land, ie; Protected Area Network, so why don't we use the money being spent on developing marine parks on employing more fisheries officers instead?

Bill Nichols, Smoky Bay

Dirk responded:

Reiterated that funding of enforcement for marine parks will be addressed in future budgets and exactly how it will be addressed is beyond the scope of this meeting.

- How are HPZs going to be placed around sanctuary zones without extending whole marine park, especially where sanctuary zones are placed abutting to the boundary of the park?

Kym Woods, Ceduna

Jon responded:

Sanctuary zones will be bounded by a minimum 5km – 7km habitat protection zone wherever possible. Sanctuary zones will be buffered by HPZ except where a sanctuary zone boundary lies along an outer boundary of the marine park.

- Support the comments of an earlier gallery member who questioned the ability of DENR to police and manage new protected areas. He is concerned that this will be translated to MPAs.

Roger Freeman, Ceduna

- Are we too far down the track in the MPA planning process to implement the aforementioned “all of state waters” marine protected area concept, to help lessen the effect of MPA on industry/stakeholder groups?

Andrew Sleep, Ceduna

- How do we make sure Commonwealth fisheries do not exploit state waters given that breaches have already occurred and no prosecution has been enacted by AFMA (Australian Fisheries Management Authority).

MPLAG Member: Allan Suter, Ceduna

- The GABMP system should extend to the Western Australian border.

MPLAG Member: Allan Haseldine, Ceduna

- There have been some changes to maps produced by the MPLAG over the last few months:

1. St Francis Island SZ has been shifted east
2. Barlow's Beach SZ has been shifted west
3. Penong residents have comments re: suggested SZ at Tukkamore Beach, and the MPLAG has moved to address this issue.

LAG Member: Perry Will, Ceduna

- An apology requested from the Minister for incorrect information should be extended to all MPLAGs because the situation is not isolated to this MPLAG.

Jon responded:

There are international obligations to protect marine biodiversity at both the federal and state level, and this is being achieved by implementing a National Representative System of Marine Protected Areas. South Australia is committed to this process. There are no international commitments relating to percentages for SZs. The Scientific Working Group (SWG) and Marine Parks Council advised the Minister that, as a guideline, at least

10% of state waters in sanctuary zones would be a good "starting point for discussions" to achieve the core design principles of comprehensiveness, adequacy and representativeness. The guidelines were made available to all MPLAG Chairs and members at meeting 3 and are printed on the preliminary sanctuary zoning scenario fact sheets distributed at the meeting and through the website. It was also made clear by the Minister that the guideline may not be achievable in all parks, depending on existing local uses.

Allan Responded:

His recollection is that the representative from the Wilderness Society spoke of international commitments to put aside 10% of state waters in sanctuary zones, and DENR staff neglected to correct him.

- Would like noted that subsequent maps returned after the last meeting looked nothing like what was sent to the Scientific Working Group (SWG), therefore are not based on information that is sourced from the community.

Jonas Woolford, Streaky Bay

The SWG are not supposed to be lobbyists, but they have, in his opinion, been acting like it. Adequate scientific studies in similar environments have not been utilised, and therefore all decisions made in the light of this information is flawed.

MPLAG Member: Allan Suter, Ceduna

Jon responded:

Jon pointed out that the SWG did not draw the preliminary scenario maps, this was DENR's responsibility. The SWG provide advice at a state level and do not get involved in individual parks unless specific advice is requested. There is a significant amount of scientific work which has been undertaken in temperate waters similar to SA, with good fisheries management in place, which shows that protected areas can produce good biodiversity benefits. DENR has produced a community fact sheet listing a range of scientific studies showing examples of the benefits of sanctuary zones.

- Why are there no marine parks in Adelaide waters?

Randall Bender, Ceduna - Penong

Jon Responded:

The Encounter Marine Park extends right up to the southern suburbs of Adelaide and around 150,000 people live in that area. A marine park alone would not fix the environmental problems off the Adelaide coast. The Adelaide Coastal Waters Study identified the key threats as wastewater and stormwater pollution, which is being addressed in a joint effort involving other agencies such as NRM, EPA and various metropolitan councils.

8. Record of Meeting

- Concern expressed about the quality of scientific evidence presented. There will be difficulty complying with principles of adequacy and representativeness because the habitat mapping doesn't reflect what the locals know is there.
- Requirement for the regulations associated with the different zonings to be more clearly defined.

- The MPLAG has designed possible sanctuary zones and these will be tabled after consultation with council and the local community within approximately four weeks.
- All members of the MPLAG agree that 10% of all state waters in sanctuary zones is unachievable and unacceptable.
- Involvement with MPLAG#1 (GABMP) was identified as important to the local community who are disenfranchised with meetings being held in Adelaide.
- 27 gallery members were present and provided with an opportunity to comment.
- The MPLAG unanimously believed that there should be more public acknowledgement that there are no binding international obligations to include 10% of state waters in sanctuary zones. This is a guideline developed by the Scientific Working Group. There are international obligations to develop the MPA network which satisfies the criteria of adequacy, representativeness, etc.

9. Next Meeting

No date or time was set for the next meeting.

Meeting Closed at 1:14pm

Chair

Date

Actions item summary as at 14/2/2011

Meeting No.	Responsibility	Action	Status	Date
5	DENR	Meeting 5, scheduled for April to be moved to July to enable the MPLAG time to consult with council and community, and the Marine Parks team to consult with peak stakeholder groups.	Unanimously supported	