

Kangaroo Island
MARINE PARK LOCAL ADVISORY GROUP

MINUTES

The fourth meeting of the Kangaroo Island Marine Park Local Advisory Group (MPLAG) was held at 1pm, on the 17 February 2011, in the Lions RAOB Hall, Kingscote.

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: Andy Gilfillan (Chair), Terry Lehmann, Ken Rowe, Matthew Ingram, Tony Geyer, Fraser Vickery, Bruce Weatherspoon, Mary-Alice Ballantine-Swan, John Lavers, Che Spruyt, Michael Fooks (Proxy for Bevan Patterson), Cherie Tyley, Graham Connell, Graham Walden, Margi Prideaux (late).

Supporting Staff: Phil Hollow, Robyn Morcom, Alison Wright, Simon Bryars, Joan Smolinski, Bill Haddrill(minutes).

Gallery: 60 people present in the gallery.

1. Welcome

Andy Gilfillan (Chair) welcomed MPLAG and gallery members to the meeting.

2. Apologies

Nil.

3. Other business

Nil.

4. Minutes from previous meeting

Minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2010 were not accepted by the membership with a need to make the following changes:

- Page 4 - Zone S should read – This possible sanctuary zone extends from north of the Cygnet River to the eastern end of the Nepean Bay Conservation Park, excluding an area in the south west corner of Nepean Bay. 19km² beach access for recreational fishing.
- Page 6 - Gallery Danny Brock – was a response to a statement about seagrass.
- Page 9 - Tony Geyer's statement should include mention of Bryan McDonald and a team of divers, had consultants and members of the Kangaroo Island community providing knowledge and assistance with data collection.

Minutes of meeting held on 3 June 2010, Cherie Tyley requested the following amendment be made:

- Page 6 - Tony Geyer said "Many other countries around the world have MP, even Thailand has a marine park. Cherie Tyley said in response but it has no regulations – its just lines on a map."

5. Correspondence:

Email from Che Spruyt for inclusion in meeting 4 minutes:

Dear Mr chair of KI MPLAG,

I write to state my concern regarding the lack of accuracy in the minutes of the KI MPLAG on the 17 of february 2011. At this meeting I asked for an inclusion in the previous meetings minutes regarding Phill Hollows introduction of DENR diver Simon Bryars diving experiance of KI as being extensive. I considered Mr Hollows statement to be misleading of the LAG and gallery. When I questioned this it came out that Simon had NO diving experiance of the south and western coasts of KI and limited of eastern KI. This conversation never made it into the minutes of that meeting, at the meeting dated feb 17 2011 I raised this and was assured by Phill Hollows that an ammendment would be made to the previous meetings minutes, this is not in the current draft minutes for meeting feb 17 2011, I am extremely annoyed at this as I believe that DENR are selectively recording the minutes, could you please raise this at tomorrows workshop as I am unable to attend due to work commitments.

Kind regards
Che Spruyt

Additional correspondence was provided to MPLAG members and tabled at the meeting.

6. Share community feedback on preliminary sanctuary zones scenarios (note form)

Bill Haddrill – Welcomed the MPLAG members and commented that he was an observer only to the proceedings.

Graham Walden – Has some concerns with preliminary sanctuary zones scenarios.

Graham Connell – was concerned that some sanctuary zones will be non-negotiable. In response, Phil indicated that this was absolutely not the case.

Phil Hollow – In response to a comment regarding a marine parks presentation to elected members and staff of the KI Council, Phil noted that all information that had been provided to Council had also been provided to the MPLAG.

Cherie Tyley – Many letters had been received supporting sanctuary zones but the one line in the letters is not sufficient. Letters need to say something/refer to the size, position and reasons the sanctuary zone is supported.

Michael Fooks – Concerned with the matter of the displaced effort package.

Che Spruyt – Concerned with the matter of the displaced effort, size of sanctuary zones, compensation and statutory authorities.

John Lavers – on his analysis of the letters received he found the major theme was the size of the sanctuary zones and this appears to be one of the issues to be resolved.

Mary-Alice Ballantine-Swan – Positive public meetings; people are passionate; feedback on the sizes of the sanctuary zones is that Kangaroo Island has unique biodiversity and there is support for the size of zones and that something positive can go to the Minister for Environment and Conservation.

Bruce Weatherspoon – SAMPIT issue regarding the type of information collected; many people he has spoken to fish in the proposed sanctuary zones; the size and location of sanctuary zones are an issue.

Fraser Vickery – Debate on the size of sanctuary zones, location and the shape of them especially on the north coast, particularly in marine parks 12 and 15 noting some issues around the science.

Tony Geyer – Questioned the size of sanctuary zones. In particular, how size and shape will provide for 5% displaced effort, noting the particular affect on the rock lobster industry.

Matthew Ingram – Location and marking of parks; straight lines, GPS co-ordinates and place names on maps would make maps easier to read.

Terry Lehmann – Concerns with zones S, T, U and R, especially U.

Ken Rowe – Disappointed the process has divided the community. Need to balance out the application of the design principles with social and economic considerations. Unrealistic representation to people of the size of the sanctuary zones. Slap in the face to the community that they are not looking after the environment. Marine Park regulations and other regulations need to come out. If multiple proposals are not put forward, then the processes will fail. DENR should test 5% or 10% sanctuary zone model. Current proposal needs considerable reconsideration against the Design Principles.

7. Questions from the gallery agenda item brought forward:

Kate Venables – packets of correspondence received may be a reaction to media articles that all of Kangaroo Island is against sanctuary zones.

Question – sanctuary zone size, how will that effect overall representation if they were made smaller?

Gallery - Beach fishing won't be allowed especially on the east coast so not allowing people to fish there is not on.

Martine Kinloch – Scientific Working Group member. Size of sanctuary zones are the minimum recommended as determined by a literature review. If sanctuary zones are too small there will be no beneficial effect, this then relates to adequacy.

Justin Phillips – representing Southern Rock Lobster Industry – noted that the Minister commented that this is a community meeting, with DENR's role being to assist with mapping and administration. Local community to have the input. Rock lobster industry has not signed off on design principles nor have other commercial groups.

Michael Pengilly – Noted that he will be putting a motion to Parliament to put a moratorium on marine parks. He argued that the Government does not have the millions of dollars required to pay out in compensation and noted that this is not just a Kangaroo Island issue, but a state-wide issue. He noted that there should be a select committee to look at the environmental and social impacts.

Justin Phillips – Displace effort working group disbanded. No feedback from the Minister on the work done by that group. Outstanding issue who or who isn't eligible. Legal advice sought. Significant cost to the state in the millions of dollars. Phil commented that the Minister wrote the Displaced Effort Working group thanking them for their effort over the past 2 or so years and has outlined very clearly the Governments position on displaced effort and compensation.

Paul – Not all scientists agree with benefits of sanctuary zones. Three fisheries professors disagree. Questioned the purpose of the meeting?

Andy Gilfillan (Chair) – DENR has provided some starting points for zones to get people to start working on producing a draft of the sanctuary zones.

John – Believed the agreement was to put information in public library before meeting? Phil responded that this was not the agreement.

Phil Hollow introduced the DENR team and provided an overview of the meeting – noting that it is the role of the MPLAG to provide the varied opinions of the community into the process. The team and the MPLAG are not responsible for where the zones will go - the community to provide advice to the Minister. The preliminary sanctuary zones are designed to stimulate debate in the MPLAG process. This is the first time input from the community has been sought so early in the process. Phil noted that, what we are hearing from the community, in general, is that the sizes of the sanctuary zones are too large. Should people be identified who provided information on sanctuary zones? These people have to live in the community and are often unwilling to be identified.

Andy Gilfillan (Chair) – Transparency is long overdue and if you are prepared to put lines on a map be prepared to attend a meeting and stand up and provide your reasons for it. Everyone is encouraged to have a go and put information in.

Bob – Wants to be provided with reasons for zones, eg there is a particular species therefore this area has been selected.

Michael Pengilly – Need to talk about species not fish.

Justin Phillips – There are discrepancies in communication between the Minister for Environment and Conservation, Chief Executive Officer (DENR) and DENR; discrepancy between what is coming out of PIRSA and DENR, budget and funding.

Ray Louth – Weather already keeps boat fishing activity down, therefore KI has good quality waters. Sanctuary zones should include regulations to restrict bottom damage rather than general activity restrictions. The west coast is too treacherous for most activities, therefore it doesn't need additional protection. Tourism will take a slump. Kangaroo Island is a self regulatory sanctuary zone therefore only need to put in restrictions on activities that lead to damage of the sea floor.

Gallery member - Science tells us sanctuary zone biodiversity increases – creating a spill over effect to areas outside these zones.

Che Spruyt – Commented that there is no authorship on the science information (benefits) fact sheet,.

Cherie Tyley – The science benefits fact sheet should compare similar countries rather than Spain etc where conditions are not like in Australia. Phil commented that the examples were from around the world some in very similar temperate waters as ours.

8. MPLAG Members Workshop

MPLAG Executive Officer, Phil Hollow, Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) gave a short presentation which included:

- Process/way forward post MPLAG meeting 4, including the management planning process;
- Brief review and reminder about using the sanctuary zone checklist when considering alterations to the preliminary sanctuary zones.

Robyn Morcom, (DENR) gave a presentation on the suggested zoning alterations that community and MPLAG members have provided since MPLAG meeting 3.

Members' comments from around the table: see Appendix 1.

9. Recommended community feedback

Margi Prideaux – Concerned with the limited time between MPLAG meetings 4 and 5 to work on zoning scenarios.

Phil Hollow replied - that more meetings can be held in the interim but timeline cannot be extended.

Gallery member - will the MPLAG be involved in the draft management plan process? Can the MPLAG influence the draft management plans?

Gallery member - concern only one scenario – no mechanism in this process to trial different scenarios with different zone size percentages.

Andy Gilfillan – Pressure of the April deadline is not acceptable.

Justin Phillips – Will the Minister have his position on Displaced Effort confirmed by March before the stakeholder consultation?

Bruce Weatherspoon – feels it imperative that there is an extra meeting after MPLAG meeting 5 to provide feedback to the community.

Ken Rowe – SAMPIT information not as good as it should be. Social/economic considerations have not been taken into account. Lack of input hopefully will be resolved in the current process.

Bob – How will the sanctuary zone percentage be divided amongst the state, will it be evenly distributed?

At this point Robyn Morcom and Alison Wright presented the zoning suggestions/advice received so far. Comments were made on each zone (see Appendix 1).

9. Communications planning

Some MPLAG members have not received responses from their communities.

10. **Record of Meeting** The Chair and the E.O to develop.

11. **Next meeting.** To be advised but likely to be around the end of April

Meeting Closed at 7 pm.

Chair

Date

Action Item summary as at 18 November 2011. (need to see Phil or Robyn about these)

Meeting No	Responsibility	Action	Status	Date
4	Executive Officer and Chair	Additional meetings to be held between 4 and 5 to consider zoning scenarios	Ongoing	