

Lower Yorke Peninsula
MARINE PARK LOCAL ADVISORY GROUP

MINUTES

The fifth meeting of the Lower Yorke Peninsula Marine Park Local Advisory Group (MPLAG) was held at 5pm, on Monday, 9 May 2011, in the Institute Hall, Edithburgh.

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: Peter Stockings (Chair), Russel Boord, David Higgins, Terry Braund, Trevor Carpenter (until 5:30pm, proxy for Greg James who joined the meeting at 6pm), Chris Johnson, Shane Bishop (proxy for Fred Hendry), Brian Klingberg, Keryn Dawes (arrived late).

DENR Staff: David Pearce, Sheralee Cox, Amanda Gaetjens, Yvette Eglinton, and Craig Nixon.

Gallery: 65 people present in the gallery.

1. Welcome

Peter Stockings welcomed the Marine Parks Local Advisory Group (MPLAG) members and gallery to the meeting.

2. Apologies/absent, correspondence and other business

Apologies: Jo Barrie, George Walker, Ros DeGaris and Peter Bartram.

Absent: none.

Correspondence:

The following correspondence was tabled for member's information:

- A letter to the MPLAG Chairs from the Minister for Environment and Conservation (MEC), dated 21 April 2011.
- A letter from the Conservation Council SA dated 29 April 2011 – *Open letter to all Marine Park Local Advisory Group Members*. The MPLAG Chair summarised the letter to the members. In response, a MPLAG member indicated that the letter was received too late in the process.
- Members were provided with a copy of the 'A review by the Scientific Working Group on Professor Bob Kearney's document 'Comments on the document "Science shows marine park benefits' (*Marine Parks, Government of South Australia, undated as requested by David Hall*).
- Letter from the *South Australian Sardine Industry Association Inc* to MPLAG Chair dated 6 May 2011.
- A letter to the MEC from resident of Kapunda dated 7 April 2011, regarding a proposed sanctuary zone surrounding Stansbury.

- An email to DENR from a resident of Wool Bay requesting that fishing be maintained around Wool Bay, Port Giles and near Stansbury.
- An email to DENR dated 27 April suggesting sanctuary zones for Marine Park 13.
- David Pearce shared that there had also been a meeting with Ros DeGaris of Adelaide Brighton Cement at which DENR followed up the issues raised at MPLAG meeting 4.
- The MPLAG Chair shared with the gallery that there had also been several informal meetings of MPLAG members and the Marine Park 13 Action Group since MPLAG meeting 4 to progress the Group's advice.

Other Business:

- None discussed.

3. Minutes and actions arising from Meeting 4

- Note: The ratification of the previous meeting's minutes (MPLAG meeting 4) was not completed during the meeting. Therefore, via email, the Chair moved a motion to accept the minutes. A quorum of members gave written support to this motion, with the previous minutes were accepted as an accurate record.

4. Today's meeting and Minister's advice to MPLAG members

David Pearce gave a short presentation which included the following.

- A summary of the marine parks implementation process and timeline, including a reminder that this meeting is the last opportunity for the MPLAG to put consolidated community advice to government. Individuals will also be able to respond to the draft management plans when they are released.
- The full public consultation on the draft management plans with zoning is planned for November 2011 for a period of 12 weeks.
- No peak stakeholders have provided specific feedback on MPLAG zoning advice.
- The zoning advice developed since MPLAG 4 by the community and MPLAG members, which proposed three sanctuary zones plus maintaining Coobowie as an Aquatic Reserve, was shown to those present.
- A review of the zoning options based on the zoning advice received from the MPLAG at meeting 4 was provided.
- There was a reminder that the Minister had written to all the MPLAG Chairs suggesting that the MPLAG zoning advice should be based on a 'competent and balanced' design.

MPLAG members and the gallery made the following statements and asked the following questions during the presentation:

- The MPLAG lacks formal scientific expertise so how will it be known whether their proposal is competent? There was concern that the MPLAG's zoning plan will be changed by DENR, the Marine Parks Council or the Scientific Working Group. David Pearce explained that the rapid assessment documents have been provided to help the MPLAG members understand

how the competence of zoning plans will be assessed. Irrespective, the MPLAG's proposal will be placed unaltered on DENR's website.

- Will the MPLAG receive a copy of the advice provided to the Minister for Environment and Conservation? In response, the zoning advice map from MPLAG 5 will be put on the marine parks website, along with the meeting minutes, and will be publicly available.
- Who will be responsible for the economic costings? How will the community be involved in the process? In response, the impact statements will be developed by an independent external contractor and SARDI/PIRSA will be contracted to evaluate the impact upon fisheries.
- Who will pay for compensation for any loss of property value? DENR does not expect property values to be adversely impacted by marine parks. The impact statements will ascertain this.
- Why didn't you take into account the national benthic layers which were given to MPLAG members and put on the website when you conducted the rapid assessment? In response, Yvette Eglinton (DENR) said that the national mapping was done several years ago. It is not as accurate as the state mapping which has been verified with video drops. But both layers are a useful guide.
- Isn't 20-25% too much to put aside for unmapped areas? In response, the guideline is 20-25% of each habitat located in the marine park, and this includes unmapped habitats. Unmapped habitats should still be protected across depth, temperature and exposure gradients.
- Why do inter-tidal rocky reefs need protection in a marine park when they are already protected under another Act? In response, their inclusion in sanctuary zones provides additional protection and connects the inter-tidal areas out into the deeper water.
- As a fisher person, I notice the bottom changes. Is the government going to keep moving and increasing the zones when the habitat moves? In response, the *Marine Parks Act 2007* was amended to require any zoning change to be approved by both Houses of Parliament. Park management plans are not scheduled for review until 10 years after implementation.
- Under the Edithburgh Jetty, a diver has noticed that there has been lots of slime believed to be from shipping. What are marine parks going to do about shipping and other pollutants? In response, other activities will continue to be managed under current arrangements. The *Marine Parks Act 2007* has amended 12 other Acts, requiring the management of those activities to help ensure the Objects of the Marine Parks Act are delivered.
- Will people be fined for having a fishing rod in a sanctuary zone? In response, this will not occur. You can still transit through a sanctuary zone or remain within a sanctuary zone as long as your fishing gear is stowed.
- Prof Anthony Cheshire said that 7-10km is a radial measurement in every direction (150km² minimum) not a square measure. You are misleading the public here. In response, the guidance from the Minister says to include whole habitats or areas with minimum dimensions of 7-10km (or 5km where State waters is only 3nm wide).

- Another gallery member asked why then, given the guidelines, did DENR come out with a proposal which had 8km by 24km zone adjacent to Port Moorowie? In response, this was an area that according to SAMPIT has very little fishing activity, and the guidelines are minimum dimensions.
- A MPLAG member stated that Port Moorowie residents chose not to enter information into SAMPIT which meant that the area nearby appeared to have little or no fishing activity.
- How are the zones going to be policed? In response, compliance is a Government responsibility. DENR holds primary responsibility however an agreement is being discussed in which DENR would provide PIRSA Fisheries with additional resources to assist with this process.
- What are marine parks going to do to stop introduced marine species? In response, sanctuary zones have been shown to restore natural predator to prey balances which can make ecosystems more resilient to invasive species. PIRSA will continue to manage introduced marine species.
- What sort of weight do peak stakeholders have compared to other groups? In response, David shared that MPLAG advice would be provided to the Minister along with the stakeholder advice.

Ian Winton, Chair of the Marine Park 13 Action Group was invited to present to the MPLAG and gallery.

The MPLAG members were provided with a copy of the submission from the Action Group, (attached).

The presentation included the following points:

- A review of how the Action Group was formed and their membership.
- The submission, which included a copy of a map of the Group's proposed zones.
- They shared that the Action Group has been working closely with the MPLAG members and they were thanked for their time and openness.
- The MEC has said it is the final meeting but the Action Group will continue to work and monitor the process.
- Ian thanked David and the team for their effort but indicated he has a problem with the strategies behind the program.
- Ian shared that the Group believes that PIRSA Fisheries have been excluded from the process thus far.
- The Group don't believe that DENR will undertake a meaningful socio-economic study.
- There is a fear that the DENR will ignore input from the community.
- Their preferred position is the Moratorium which is before government to stop the process continuing.

- Although the Action Group wants to stop this process, they have provided an alternative zoning plan under duress.
- They believe the Group needs to take a whole of Peninsula focus. The Action Group is talking to all Chairs and Council members on Yorke Peninsula.
- The Action Group's zoning plan proposes the following requirements:
 - No land based fishing restrictions on Yorke Peninsula;
 - DENR is required to publish the socio-economic details on the zoning plan by the end of May;
 - The details of where the remaining three zoning types will be located needs to be provided;
 - The Group would like a commitment that the Commonwealth marine park sanctuaries wont affect Yorke Peninsula;
 - Specific habitats and species that are identified in each zone need to be identified in the management plan;
 - The Group believe that the MPLAG and the DENR staff present weren't given the appropriate tools for public consultation and because of this damage has been done to communities;
 - DENR should come back to the community with a comprehensive community consultation program.
- David Pearce indicated that around 100 people came to the Edithburgh information day over Easter and that many who came to the day indicated that 90% of the problems would be resolved if the Troubridge Shoals was not made a sanctuary zone.

MPLAG Chair invited others in the gallery or membership to present.

- MPLAG member Trevor Carpenter relayed the following on behalf of Port Moorowie residents:
 - Pt Moorowie residents have formed a group as they were concerned with the proposed sanctuary zone located in front of Port Moorowie.
 - A 15 page report had been written outlining their three proposals for the area. This was put to DENR, the MPLAG Chair and the MEC.
 - Greg James will be arriving with three letters highlighting their disappointment that no response had been received on the proposal. Trevor requested some form of reply for the report that the group has put forward which was dated 14 February 2011.
 - There was concern that groups will be trying to look after their own areas and that this will divide the groups.
 - No consultation had occurred between Ian Winton's group and Port Moorowie but Ian was thanked for his efforts. There was concern that the Marine Park 13 Action Group's proposal has moved zones.
 - Trevor indicated that he was uncomfortable acting as a proxy of the MPLAG.
- A MPLAG member (Greg James) indicated that the area surrounding Edithburgh would be over fished in five years time because the zones are not distributed equally around the coastline. He shared that the map with the alternative zones developed by his group was available on his website. In response, David Pearce indicated that this was the forum to share that map with the MPLAG.
- In response, the MPLAG Chair indicated that the Port Moorowie report was in fact provided to, and considered by, the MP 13 Action Group.

- David Pearce indicated that the Minister was in the process of providing a reply to the Port Moorowie proposal and that he believed the submission was acknowledged in the minutes from MPLAG meeting 4.
- The Chair asked the gallery to leave the hall at 7pm so that the MPLAG members could consider all the feedback presented and decide upon their final advice to the government. The Chair thanked the gallery for their questions.

5. MPLAG Member's final zoning advice

- Members discussed the sanctuary zones at each of the locations and their advice is provided below. Each MPLAG member was offered the opportunity to share information.
- Three proposals were selected by the membership. The membership put forward a motion to vote on each of these proposals to indicate the level of support for each one.
 - Option 1: Action Group proposal.
 - Option 2: A proposal as suggested by MPLAG Member Greg James, with one large sanctuary zone that extends out from the proposed Point Davenport Zone A, along the park boundary and back in to join the Troubridge Hill Zone C, with Zone B near Port Moorowie removed.
 - Option 3: Same as Option 1 but with Zone B and Zone A narrowed and extended further out to sea.
- The membership voted on each of the options.
 - Option 1: no support for this proposal by the membership.
 - Option 2: minority support for this proposal – 1 member.
 - Option 3: majority support for this proposal.
 - Zones A and C were supported but changes were made to Zone B
 - **Outcome:** majority support was received for Option 3.
- Members also supported the following inclusion: unanimous support by membership for the inclusion of the Coobowie estuary as a sanctuary zone inland from the causeway.
- Minority support (one member) was received for a sanctuary zone on the seaward side of the causeway which extended into the aquatic reserve.

Option 3 includes:

Members discussed each sanctuary zone selected and identified the reasoning and importance of each of the zones chosen.

- **Zone A:** This zone includes Point Davenport estuary which is an ecologically important feature, as well as being one of the only two estuaries located on the Yorke Peninsula. The surrounding seagrass beds and shallows provide important habitat, with the zone covering a range of depths from the shoreline to the seaward edge of the zone. This zone is also an important location for coastal bird life.
- It was recommended that the western boundary of the sanctuary zone should align with the western extent of the Point Davenport Conservation Park and that it has a north-south boundary line and not parallel to the current diagonal outer boundary.

- **Zone B:** This zone was reduced in width to assist fishing from the boat ramp at Port Moorowie. The zone extends from the shoreline across a variation of habitats at different depths protecting a range of habitats and animals.
- **Zone C:** This zone extends from the western boundary of Troubridge Hill Aquatic Reserve to midway through the reserve, to the Troubridge Hill lighthouse. It then extends out to the boundary of the marine park. This sanctuary zone builds on the existing aquatic reserve, one of the design principles of the marine park, and provides a transition from the cliffs, through a variety of habitats into the deeper water.
- **Zone E:** This zone is located at Coobowie Bay Estuary, inland from the causeway. Coobowie estuary is an ecologically important feature and the only other estuary on Yorke Peninsula. It is an important nursery area, particularly for King George whiting.

Note:

- Members asked that a number of factors be recognised, unique to Marine Park 13, that were considered when trying to choose appropriate areas for sanctuary zones:
 - The northern section of the park, near Port Giles and Klein Point is unavailable for adequately sized sanctuary zones because of transshipment points and ports and harbour activities. It was calculated that out of approximately 113km² of the north eastern section of the park, around 15% (this included areas of the ports located outside of the park) is effectively impossible to identify adequate sized sanctuary zones within.
 - If the preliminary sanctuary zones had been implemented some 44% of the marine park would have been placed under some restrictions as there are aquatic reserves off Coobowie Bay, Troubridge Island and Troubridge Point.
 - Although the membership recognise the ecological value of the area surrounding Troubridge Shoals, due to strong public response and a clear recognition of the area as a very popular fishing ground, the MPLAG have purposely avoided including a sanctuary zone in this area.
- The MPLAG Chair highlighted that the MPLAG members have tried to consult with the community, council, boat owners and fishers as much as possible and have undertaken the job in a difficult situation. The MPLAG member's role was to bring a broad cross section of community input into the process. The membership identified that the committee had respectfully listened to each other throughout a difficult process.
- The MPLAG Chair thanked members for their involvement in the process which has run over the past year. The MPLAG would also like to thank the staff, particularly David, for his involvement in the process. The members will continue to follow the process with great interest.
- Greg James would like the MPLAG Chair to tell the MEC, if the opportunity arises, to thank the DENR staff for their efforts throughout the process.
- David thanked the MPLAG members for the hours of efforts they have given throughout the process as volunteers and stated he would keep in contact with members in the future. He acknowledged that they faced a very difficult challenge, having to try to work between a government process and the community.

6. Comments from the gallery

- Additional information was asked for/shared by members of the gallery during the first two hours of the meeting. The following issues were discussed:
 - the impact that park zoning may have on small communities;
 - management of marine parks and national parks;
 - the potential impact on tourism in the area and the role of the SA Tourism Industry Council. (Jo Barrie is a member of the MPLAG, has been sharing advice and providing tourism-related input into the process.);
 - the role of the community in environmental, social and economic impact statements;
 - how MPLAG advice will be used by Government and the possible influence of other stakeholder group advice;
 - the formal public consultation process on draft management plans, due to commence late in 2011; and
 - processes for engaging Adelaide-based developers and real estate agents.

7. Record of Meeting

- A brief summary of key meeting points was developed by the MPLAG Chair directly after the meeting. The Record of the Meeting is available on the DENR marine parks website.

- David Pearce thanked the MPLAG members for their involvement throughout the process.

Meeting Closed at 10.15pm.

Chair

Date