

**LOWER SOUTH EAST**  
**MARINE PARK LOCAL ADVISORY GROUP**

## **MINUTES**

The third meeting of the Lower South East Marine Park Local Advisory Group (MPLAG) was held at 5pm on 15 November 2010 in the Southgate Motel Conference Room, 175 Commercial St East, Mt Gambier.

*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:** Grant King (Chair person), Ruth Beach, Lionel Carrison, Maureen Christie, Garry Clifford, Jim Godden, Ken Jones, Richard Sage, Bob Oliver, Peter Whitehead, Joel Redman, Biddie Tietz.

**DEH staff:** Karen Heaver (Minute taker), Phil Hollow, Jon Emmett, Louise Jones, Shane Holland, David Miller, Steve Bourne.

**Proxies:** Nil

**Gallery:** Seven members of the public attended.

### **1. Welcome**

Grant welcomed members, DENR staff and members of the public to the meeting.

### **2. Apologies:** Peter Dunicliff.

**Absent:** Nil.

### **Correspondence**

Letter received from Conservation Council SA. A copy of the letter was provided to members.

**Action:** Correspondence to be sent out with the agenda.

### **3. Actions arising**

Minutes of the meeting held 26 May 2010 were accepted.

Items raised were update on displaced compensation (refer point 5), a combined meeting with the Upper SE LAG (Grant to organise) and the need to meet more often due to the amount of information provided. The issue of correspondence being sent to LAG members prior to meetings was raised as was the issue of members receiving draft minutes of each meeting. There was a suggestion that they should receive these within 2 weeks following each meeting.

At LAG meeting # 4 Joel Redman advised that his comments (regarding no binding obligation to meet UN target for sanctuary zone sizes) were not made clear enough in the minutes considering their importance. He also noted that there had not been an adequate response to requests for more spatial indepth maps (provided at this meeting) or information on the Otway bioregions and Commonwealth guidelines. He also noted that an out of session meeting with the Upper South East MPLAG did not occur.

## Action Items from 26 May 2010 meeting

| Meeting No. | Responsibility  | Action  | Status                           | Comment                             |
|-------------|-----------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2           | <i>P Hollow</i> | "State of Play" regarding Piccaninnie Ponds CP and the boundary               | Completed                        | Steve Bourne gave a verbal response |
| 2           | <i>P Hollow</i> | Collate MPLAG members comments on SAMPIT maps and provide feedback to members | Completed                        |                                     |
| 2           | <i>Members</i>  | Complete worksheets with regard to identifying management issues              | Ongoing                          |                                     |
| 2           | <i>P Hollow</i> | Follow up status of Values Statement  | Released in next couple of weeks | Completed                           |
| 2           | <i>G King</i>   | Speak with Phil about an out of session meeting                               | To be arranged if required       |                                     |

#### 4. Chairs meeting with Minister

LAG Chairs met with the Minister on 26 August 2010. Grant advised that the meeting was well attended with a full and frank discussion over a 2 hour period. The Minister was clear on expectations including that the next LAG meetings are a starting point for zoning discussions and that there will be a reasonable and lengthy consultation process. The State Government is committed to Marine Parks and he understood there is a trust issue amongst recreational and commercial fisherman and local communities. The Chairs agreed it was beneficial to engage with the Minister at this stage of the process.

#### 5. Preliminary Sanctuary Zone Scenario

Joel advised that with regard to providing information for SAMPIT that the commercial fishing sector is being administered separately and therefore their information is not included in the detail being discussed at this meeting. This information will be provided soon.

Phil advised that it is proposed that a draft management plan, with zoning, will be prepared around mid 2011 and then this plan will be available to the community for comment for a further period of time. Meeting three and four will discuss the zoning and by meeting 5 it is proposed that zoning arrangements will inform the draft management plan.

Phil briefly mentioned the achievements to date, benefits of marine parks, what sanctuary zones will protect, outer boundaries and that depth classes and summer & winter sea surface temperatures have been used to assist in developing preliminary zones. He also advised members that there are tools to help MPLAG members including the Atlas and the check list that has been provided to assist in determining zones and sanctuary zone guidance.

Phil showed maps of the preliminary sanctuary zone scenarios and photos to show a range of reefs, small inlets, rocky areas and beaches. It was made very clear that these scenario maps are only a "starting point".

#### 6. Members Discuss Preliminary Sanctuary Zone Scenario

Lengthy discussion was held with regard to the possible sanctuary zones provided including:

- No. 2 Rocks in the Canunda NP is a major fishing area and is included in a proposed sanctuary zone; this will be a big issue.
  - Response - Agreed
- Difficult to identify where the actual boundaries are from the maps provided.
  - Response – Agreed. See actions
- Most of the proposed sanctuary zones go right to the beach (no beach fishing).
  - Response – Some possible sanctuary zones do overlay to median high water mark.
- It was previously mentioned that “beach access is retained” but obviously not necessarily beach fishing access.
  - Response. Agreed as per Whole of Government commitment.
- If boundaries are based on represented habitat how can they be moved?
  - Response. We find similar habitats in the same area.
- We are in the same Otway bioregion as Victoria so why do we need Marine parks here when they have theirs in place. Can DENR provide a written response?
  - Response Agreed to provide a written response as soon as possible.
- Can the public see where the zones are?
  - Response - Preliminary zones will be released to the public after each meeting, placed on the DENR website and media releases undertaken. Maps will show what is important in each proposed zone.
- DENR has not addressed the threats.
  - Response.- The threats have been addressed however, this is not only a threat based process but one that provides a level of protection for representative samples of S.A's marine and coastal habitats.
- 10% is too big an area. Need to reduce the total area and start with a reduced area, say 5%.
  - Response - There is no binding obligation for size, no arbitrary target.
- Require clarification in relation to what the Commonwealth signed up to and what the State is trying to achieve. Is it a % of statewide area, impact on gross value state wide? 1% of rock lobster fishing ground, not much rock lobster in the Commonwealth area.
- 84% of the population live in Adelaide, but no marine park. Regional SA has taken the brunt of the 10% which comes from the remaining 44% of remaining waters.
  - Response – There is a Marine Park along the southern Adelaide coastline where 160000 people reside.
- Commercial fishers have information that other members don't have. DENR bring different people to meetings, other members need someone who can confirm DENR information.
  - Response - These are public meetings that anyone can attend.
- LAG members have local knowledge.
  - Response - Agreed
- Require commercial information and displaced effort compensation formula before we discuss zoning.
- Need commercial information prior to making decisions.

## 7. MPLAG Initial Advice to DENR

### Summary comments by members:

Peter – Sanctuary zone area is too large and in sensitive areas. First role is to convince the Minister to reduce the area to 5%. Still have the Minister's consent for recreational fisherman to have access to the beach, including fishing. No need for national parks to cross with marine parks (eg Piccaninnie Ponds).

Ken – Early times, keep an open mind.

Richard – Access to/along the beach, play on words. Do anchors damage the marine

environment?

Jim – Difficult to look at individual areas, vested interest, let it run its course. We need to educate children, not lock up areas, and provide safe areas for family activities (fishing, snorkelling, playing on beach). Why can't the exclusion zone just include the "rocks" off shore and not the whole area?

Ruth – A & B look like they are not in medium profile reefs, harbour in A which has an impact, disagree with comments about size should be smaller, support larger area of 25-30%.

Lionel – Shocked with proposed zones, but have to start somewhere. Need to know outcome of compensation before zoning.

Bob – Acceptable as a starting point.

Garry – A starting point, too big an area, beach access to fish is an issue. Suggest a 100m easement zone for recreational fishers along the beach.

Biddie – What is the tourism impact including inland tourism ramifications if zoning/fishing restrictions especially for recreational fishers.

Maureen – Inter tidal zone interest, not interested in a 100m easement zone on the beach. Some issues could be addressed by other means eg modify behaviour with dogs, vehicles, public education. Outer boundary areas have already been reduced from the initial proposal.

Joel – Interesting that you can drive on beaches within a sanctuary zone, which is destructive? This process is different to other government processes he has been involved with in the past.

Grant – Area is too great, Green Point impact will be huge, restrictions on fishing along the coastline is an issue.

Phil advised that sanctuary zones have restrictions on dogs in that they must be on a lead and stay in a vehicle or on a boat. Medium/high water mark is the proposed boundary. The Government gave a commitment that access to beaches won't be denied.

Gallery questions:

Chris VonStanke – He is a 5<sup>th</sup> generation fisherman and the resource has been sustained. Each generation gets smarter with its processes of sustainability so it is preserved for future generations. Why should regional SA pay for Adelaide mess ups, they should be accountable and marine park areas declared in Adelaide so areas are regenerated. Why are some areas no take zones when footage of the areas under water shows it is not damaged and is still preserved under existing arrangements?

John Ashby – Area "C" will affect 15 rock lobster boats. Will boats be able to cross through sanctuary zones?

Phil – Yes they will but all equipment has to be stowed.

There was some discussion about whether all the information is available to assist in making decisions such as information on the Otway Bio regions and the Commonwealth guidelines.

Grant – All we can do at this stage is work within a framework and use our own, and community, experience. The challenge is to present the final proposed zones to the level as good as we can get. This is a Government process and commitment and we have the opportunity to comment so we all need to make the most of it.

Phil presented to members some large maps (which were left with Grant if members want to borrow them) which show the zones and there was discussion about whether members could each obtain a copy of these maps but smaller maps have been provided and they will be constantly changing.

**Action:** Phil to discuss with GIS staff the opportunity to provide better maps, as members agreed that the maps provided were not specific enough to take to community groups. Ideally the maps could include numbers in the hexagons, latitude and longitude of the park boundaries and GPS.

Object of this group is to look at the material provided, discuss it, consult, will/won't work, options, result to be what members and the community can "wear".

**Action:** Members are asked to take the maps to their community groups and bring feedback by Jan 28<sup>th</sup> 2011 so we can develop updated scenarios for the next meeting of this LAG .

Phil advised that the Regional Impact Statement is to be developed (once zones are developed). Value Statements will be released in the next couple of weeks. The process with regard to the displacement effort is still occurring and the Marine Parks Act states that the Minister must pay "fair and reasonable compensation".

## 8. Communications Plan

A draft MPLAG communication plan has been prepared which links the community to this process. If any groups would like DENR staff to visit their community for further discussion and/or assistance then they are willing to do so.

## 9. Questions from the gallery – Under point 7.

## 10. Record of Meeting

Require the minutes to be distributed sooner.

Items that Grant will advise the Minister of, and discuss with the media, is:

- Diversion of views;
- % too much, some say too little;

Grant will arrange an "out of session" meeting late January if necessary. Grant and Bill Hender (Chair of USE LAG) will also discuss having a combined meeting.

## 11. Other Business

An application has been received from John Ashby (Port MacDonnell Professional Fisherman's Association) to join the Lower SE Local Advisory Group. This Group supports his application for membership however understands that it is a DENR decision.

## 12. Next Meeting - Date to be advised.

**Meeting closed at 9pm**

.....Date.....  
Chair

### Action Items as at 15 November 2010

| Meeting No. | Responsibility                | Action   | Status           | Date                            |
|-------------|-------------------------------|--|------------------|---------------------------------|
| 3           | <i>P Hollow</i>               | Provide more detailed maps (zones on SAMPIT maps / overlay showing locations)                                |                  |                                 |
| 3           | <i>Members</i>                | Discuss the preliminary zones with community groups and provide comments to Phil Hollow to prepare new maps. |                  | <b>Jan 28<sup>th</sup> 2011</b> |
| 3           | <i>G King</i>                 | Arrange "out of session" meeting if required.  |                  |                                 |
| 3           | <i>G King</i>                 | Arrange combined LSE and USE LAG meeting   |                  |                                 |
| 3           | <i>P Hollow</i>               | Seek to distribute correspondence to LAG members prior to LAG meetings                                       |                  |                                 |
| 3           | <i>P. Hollow</i>              | Provide a written response to the question on the Otway Bioregion  |                  |                                 |
| 3           | <i>P. Hollow</i>              | Take LAG members comments regarding addition membership into consideration                                   |                  |                                 |
| 3           | <i>P. Hollow / Grant King</i> | Develop Record of meeting  | <b>Completed</b> | <b>11/10</b>                    |