

# ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS TO THE SHOALWATER ISLANDS MARINE PARK DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN

October 2007

Prepared by the  
Department of Environment and Conservation  
for the  
Marine Parks and Reserves Authority



Department of  
Environment and Conservation



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**INTRODUCTION..... 1**

**METHODS ..... 1**

**RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS..... 2**

**Table 1: Origin of submissions by interest..... 2**

**Table 2: Overall comment on the draft management plan..... 2**

**Table 3: Level of support for zones ..... 3**

**Table 4: Level of support for specific issues ..... 3**

**Table 5: Summary of comments received in public submissions..... 5**

**General comments..... 5**

**Executive summary ..... 8**

**2. Management context..... 8**  
     Responsibilities of authorities and government agencies ..... 8

**3. Management framework ..... 8**  
     Best practice management model..... 9  
     Determining management priorities ..... 10

**4. Regional perspective ..... 10**  
     Bioregional setting ..... 10  
     Oceanography ..... 10  
     Social context..... 11

**5. Definition of the area and reserve tenure..... 11**

**7.1.1 Development of a zoning scheme ..... 13**

**7.1.2 Zones in the Shoalwater Islands Marine Park..... 14**

    General comments..... 14

    Seal Island Sanctuary Zone ..... 21  
         Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form ..... 21  
         Submitters ticked “would support if changes were made” on the submission form ..... 23  
         Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form ..... 26

    Second Rock Sanctuary Zone ..... 31  
         Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form ..... 31  
         Submitters ticked “would support if changes were made” on the submission form ..... 32  
         Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form ..... 33

    Becher Point Sanctuary Zone ..... 34  
         Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form ..... 34  
         Submitters ticked “would support if changes were made” on the submission form ..... 36  
         Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form ..... 37

    Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)..... 38  
         Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form ..... 38  
         Submitters ticked “would support if changes were made” on the submission form ..... 39  
         Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form ..... 44

    Murray Reef Special Purpose Zone (Scientific Reference)..... 50  
         Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form ..... 50  
         Submitters ticked “would support if changes were made” on the submission form ..... 52  
         Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form ..... 53

    General Use Zone..... 55  
         Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form ..... 55  
         Submitters ticked “would support if changes were made” on the submission form ..... 56  
         Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form ..... 58

    Proposed Cape Peron Sanctuary Zone ..... 59  
         Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form ..... 59  
         Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form ..... 64

**7.1.3 Limitations of the zoning scheme..... 65**

**7.2 Education and interpretation..... 65**

**7.3 Public participation..... 66**

**7.4 Patrol and enforcement ..... 67**

**7.5 Management intervention and visitor infrastructure ..... 68**

<b>7.6 Monitoring</b> .....	<b>69</b>
<b>8. Development proposals within the marine park</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>9. Management of ecological and social values</b> .....	<b>71</b>
9.1 Ecological Values.....	71
<b>9.1.1 Geomorphology</b> .....	<b>74</b>
<b>9.1.2 Water and sediment quality (KPI)</b> .....	<b>74</b>
<b>9.1.4 Macroalgae (subtidal-reef) communities</b> .....	<b>77</b>
<b>9.1.8 Cetaceans</b> .....	<b>78</b>
<b>9.1.10 Little penguin (KPI)</b> .....	<b>78</b>
<b>9.1.11 Finfishes (KPI)</b> .....	<b>79</b>
<b>9.1.12 Invertebrates</b> .....	<b>80</b>
<b>9.2.1 Aboriginal heritage</b> .....	<b>81</b>
<b>9.2.2 Maritime heritage</b> .....	<b>81</b>
<b>9.2.3 Marine nature-based tourism</b> .....	<b>82</b>
<b>9.2.4 Commercial fishing</b> .....	<b>82</b>
<b>9.2.5 Aquaculture</b> .....	<b>83</b>
<b>9.2.6 Recreational fishing</b> .....	<b>83</b>
<b>9.2.7 Recreational water sports</b> .....	<b>86</b>
General comments.....	86
Waterskiing/parasailing/high-speed freestyle motorised water sports .....	87
Submitters ticked “support the removal of” on the submission form .....	87
Submitters ticked “do not support the removal of” on the submission form .....	90
8 knot speed limit within 200m of island & mainland shores in Shoalwater Bay and sanctuary zones.....	95
Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form .....	95
Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form .....	97
<b>9.2.8 Coastal and island use</b> .....	<b>99</b>
<b>13. Appendices</b> .....	<b>99</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>100</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Acronyms</b> .....	<b>100</b>

## INTRODUCTION

The Shoalwater Islands Marine Park was gazetted as an 'A' Class Reserve in 1990. Following gazettal, the *Conservation and Land Management Act 1984* (CALM Act) requires the Minister for the Environment to prepare a draft management plan to provide the public with a guide as to how the marine park will be managed into the future. It also provides the community with an opportunity to suggest ways the draft management plan could be improved. On 22 July 2006, the *Shoalwater Islands Marine Park Draft Management Plan 2006* (the plan) was released for public comment.

At this time, advertisements were placed in the *Government Gazette* and two editions of *The West Australian* and the *Sound Telegraph* advertising that the plan was available for public comment. The plan was distributed to State and local Government departments, tertiary institutions, libraries, peak bodies, stakeholder groups and numerous individuals who expressed interest during the planning process. A 'Have Your Say' brochure and submission form were produced and distributed with a copy of the plan to assist the community in preparing a submission. The plan was available for inspection at the offices and libraries in the City of Rockingham. Copies of the draft management plan were available at the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) offices in Kensington, Fremantle and Wanneroo. An electronic copy of the plan, 'Have Your Say' brochure and submission form were also available on DEC's NatureBase web site, and interested parties were able to lodge submissions electronically.

The public submission period closed on 27 October 2006. A total of 86 submissions were received by this date. This document outlines how the submissions were summarised and provides an analysis of the public submissions. It also indicates if the plan was amended, and the reasons why or why not, as a result of the public submissions.

## METHODS

The public submissions to the plan were analysed and the final management plan was prepared according to the process below.

- All submissions were recorded in a database as they were received.
- All comments were summarised and collated according to the section of the plan they addressed.
- The Shoalwater Islands Focus Group was reconvened on 7 and 23 November 2006 to review the submissions and provide their final advice to the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority (MPRA).
- The submissions, a summary of the key issues arising from the submissions and the Focus Group advice were provided to the MPRA for their consideration. The MPRA then provided their formal advice to the Minister for the Environment.
- The Government then considered this advice and the issues raised during the public submissions period before making a final decision regarding the zoning for the Shoalwater Islands Marine Park.
- DEC prepared a final management plan to give intent to the Government's decisions and address finer scale issues raised during the public submission period.
- The *Shoalwater Islands Marine Park Management Plan 2007-2017* was approved and released by the Minister for the Environment on 31 October 2007.

- The analysis of public submissions was finalised and made available on DEC’s NatureBase website, outlining whether the plan was amended in relation to the issues raised in the submissions.

## RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

A total of 86 submissions were received, comprising 59 submission forms (hardcopy and electronic), 7 emails and 20 letters. The majority (77%) of the submissions received were from individuals with 23% received from organisations representing conservation, tourism, commercial and recreational fishing, industry, education, indigenous, community interest and government sectors. Submitters were asked to identify their primary, secondary and tertiary interests in the marine park (Table 1), with the majority of submitters identifying conservation and recreational fishing as the main primary interest.

**Table 1: Origin of submissions by interest**

Interest	Primary Interest (%)	Secondary Interest (%)	Tertiary Interest (%)
Commercial fishing	3 (3%)	-	-
Conservation	15 (17%)	11 (13%)	5 (6%)
Indigenous use	3 (1%)	1 (1%)	-
Kitesurfing/windsurfing	1 (1%)	-	1 (1%)
Local/State Government Department or Authority	6 (7%)	-	-
Mining/exploration/production	1 (1%)	-	-
Not identified	5 (6%)	22 (26%)	26 (30%)
Other	3 (3%)	1 (1%)	7 (8%)
Recreational boating/sailing	6 (7%)	8 (9%)	15 (17%)
Recreational fishing	15 (17%)	7 (8%)	3 (3%)
Research	-	7 (8%)	4 (5%)
Scuba diving	6 (7%)	2 (2%)	-
Shipping/ports	-	-	-
Sightseeing/tourist	4 (5%)	4 (5%)	8 (9%)
Swimming/snorkelling	9 (10%)	18 (21%)	14 (16%)
Tourism industry	3 (3%)	4 (5%)	2 (2%)
Waterskiing/parasailing/high speed freestyle motorised water sports	6 (7%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)

Submitters were asked to provide an indication of the level of overall support they gave for the plan, and specific level of support for individual zones and issues (Tables 2-4). Overall most people indicated that the plan needed significantly more emphasis on conservation, with few submissions stating the opposite (Table 2). Submissions also indicated overall support for the zones, with the Shoalwater Islands Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation) generating the most dissension (Table 3).

**Table 2: Overall comment on the draft management plan**

Level of support	Number (%)
Significantly more emphasis on conservation required	22 (26%)
More emphasis on conservation required	10 (12%)
Good balance	10 (12%)
More emphasis on use and access required	13 (15%)
Significantly more emphasis on use and access required	5 (6%)
Not identified	26 (30%)

**Table 3: Level of support for zones**

Zone	Support (%)	Don't support (%)	Would support if changes were made (%)	No opinion/ didn't comment (%)
Seal Island Sanctuary Zone	41 (48%)	7 (8%)	16 (19%)	22 (26%)
Second Rock Sanctuary Zone	40 (47%)	6 (7%)	12 (14%)	28 (33%)
Becher Point Sanctuary Zone	36 (42%)	8 (9%)	11 (13%)	31 (36%)
Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)	27 (31%)	13 (15%)	24 (28%)	22 (26%)
Murray Reef Special Purpose Zone (Scientific Reference)	36 (42%)	6 (7%)	7 (8%)	37 (43%)
General Use	31 (36%)	7 (8%)	14 (16%)	34 (40%)

The plan also proposed restrictions for certain activities that were in addition to those applied through the zoning scheme. To ensure that individuals were aware of these restrictions and to determine community support for them, the submission form made specific reference to them.

**Table 4: Level of support for specific issues**

Issue	Yes (%)	No (%)	No opinion/ didn't comment (%)
Removal of waterskiing, parasailing and high-speed freestyle motorised water sports	52 (60%)	13 (15%)	21(24%)
Speed limit of 8 knots within 200m of mainland and island shores	50 (58%)	10 (12%)	26 (30%)
An addition sanctuary zone at Cape Peron	49 (57%)	15 (17%)	22 26%)

The analysis of public submissions to the plan is presented in Table 5.

The analysis contains:

- a summary of each major issue or point raised and the number of submissions that raised the issue;
- an indication of whether or not the comment resulted in an amendment to the final management plan and the criteria by which each comment was assessed; and
- a brief statement responding to the comment and, if appropriate, indicating what action was taken to amend the final management plan.

Submissions were assessed entirely on the merit of points raised. No subjective weighting was given to any submission due to its origin or any other factor so as to elevate its importance above any other submission. The criteria used to assess whether a change would be made to the plan are outlined below and are also referenced in Table 5.

1. The plan **was amended** if a submission:
  - a) provided additional resource information of direct relevance to management;
  - b) provided additional information on affected user groups of direct relevance to management;
  - c) indicated a change in (or clarified) government legislation, management commitment or management policy;
  - d) proposed strategies that would better achieve management objectives and aims; or
  - e) indicated omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity.

2. The plan **was not amended** if the submission:
- a) clearly supported the draft proposals;
  - b) offered a neutral statement or no change was sought;
  - c) addressed issues beyond the scope of the plan;
  - d) made points that were already in the plan or were considered during its preparation;
  - e) was one amongst several widely divergent viewpoints received on the topic and the strategy of the plan was still considered the best option; or
  - f) contributed options which are not possible (generally due to some aspect of existing legislation or Government policy).

Where submissions raised the same or related issues, these have been amalgamated where appropriate. It should be noted that minor editorial changes, (e.g. spelling mistakes, grammar and formatting) referred to in the submissions, have also been made to the plan.

**Table 1: Summary of comments received in public submissions**

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>General comments</b>			
1	<p>General support for the plan (<b>9 submissions</b>).</p> <p>In addition to the above statement, submissions also made one or more of the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the plan’s balance between marine conservation and recreational uses within the marine park (5 subs).</li> <li>• Expressed concern about the increasing population in the local area, which may increase impacts on the area in the future (1 sub).</li> <li>• Expressed concern over the impacts on the marine parks species and/or habitats, which need protection now (1 sub).</li> <li>• Stated a need for an increase in the level of enforcement (1 sub).</li> <li>• Stated that all commercial fishing should be excluded (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
2	<p>General disagreement with the plan; stated that no further management is required (<b>2 submissions</b>).</p> <p>In addition to the above statement, submissions also made one or more of the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are other management options that should be looked into before zoning (1 sub).</li> <li>• It would be too difficult to police (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	Due to historical and current usage as well as anticipated increases in visitor numbers, existing management arrangements are not considered adequate to provide for conservation and sustainable use objectives.
3	Please bring this into effect as soon as possible ( <b>2 submissions</b> ).	No (2a)	Noted. The Government will gazette the plan following the completion of the required statutory steps.
4	<p>Believes the plan doesn’t provide adequate protection for the marine park (<b>7 submissions</b>).</p> <p>In addition to the above statement, submissions also made one or more of the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This plan has been long overdue and provides us with an opportunity to get the right balance the first time by protecting our marine wildlife, which includes our dolphins, sea lions and penguins (2 subs).</li> <li>• I have been visiting the Shoalwater/Safety Bay area for 30 years and have noticed a huge decline in fish numbers, particularly reef and schooling fish. Water quality and seagrass have also deteriorated significantly in this time (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park. The plan also contains a high priority strategy to



No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is an opportunity to finally stop the degradation of this area and set it up to be a premium tourist attraction and outstanding educational and scientific classroom. It is so close to Perth, easily accessible to all people and so important for education in the industrialised world in which we live (2 subs).</li> </ul> <p>Consultation with locals and users of the area was limited (<b>4 submissions</b>). In addition to providing the above statement, submissions made one or more of the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why were no local beach fishermen consulted (1 sub)?</li> <li>Our organisation did not have a voice on the focus group involved with the drafting of the plan, particularly in regard to water skiing activities in the Shoalwater Bay area, or the impact these activities may have. Our organisation needs to be informed as to what direction the plan is to move (1 sub).</li> <li>The plan states that it was developed in consultation with the local community; the first I heard of it was via an article in the local newspaper stating that it was open for public comment. Would it not have been better to invite public comment prior to developing the plan (1 sub)?</li> </ul>	No (2d)	<p>commence the planning process to further consider a sanctuary zone off Cape Peron within the first year following gazettal of the plan.</p> <p>Continued public consultation with local user groups and stakeholders were conducted throughout the entire planning process. Specific interest groups were also represented on the Focus Group. The three month public submission provided a further opportunity and was supported by a Ministerial release and media. The difficulty in making all members of the community aware of the reserve planning processes is acknowledged.</p>
6	<p>Our organisation is concerned with the large number of broad ranging statements linked to management changes in the plan without any supporting scientific evidence. Many appear as direct attacks on recreational fishing, portraying this activity as being at the detriment of fish stocks in the marine park. The entire plan makes reference to only three peer reviewed scientific papers. The majority of references are Government agency papers and personal communications. We believe this is not adequate for a document with the purpose of independently reviewing all activities in the area (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2e)	<p>Fishing is identified as a significant pressure on targeted finfish and invertebrates of the marine park. The plan recommends a range of strategies and a zoning scheme to help achieve both sustainable use and conservation objectives. Comments on the limited use of peer reviewed scientific papers are noted.</p>
7	<p>The sewage outfall could extend seaward much further (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2c)	<p>The location of the sewage outfall is not within the marine park and therefore beyond the scope of the plan.</p>
8	<p>Control feral pigeons in these areas (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2d)	<p>Feral pigeon control is already undertaken by DEC.</p>
9	<p>No comment or provisions for foreshores have been made (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2d)	<p>The management of foreshores within the marine park are discussed in Section 9.2.8 Coastal and island use. Strategies within this section also specify working with adjacent land managers for areas outside the marine park.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
10	More rubbish control is required ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2d)	Marine debris and litter are identified as a management issue and the plan outlines strategies to deal with this issue.
11	<p>The potential impacts of climate change on the ecological and social values of the marine park are profound and available data on climate change clearly indicates that rainfall is decreasing, sea temperature is rising and water levels and degree of storminess are increasing. Possible effects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less outflow from the Peel-Harvey Estuary;</li> <li>• less groundwater and stormwater inflow to the marine park;</li> <li>• warmer temperatures that favour tropical species and higher rates of plant growth;</li> <li>• increased water levels and storminess causing increased wave energy, changes in wave direction, increased mobility of sediments and increased re-suspension of particulate matter. This has the potential to influence on coastal processes (sand bars, coastal erosion), seagrass distribution and intertidal reefs.</li> </ul> <p>These possible effects due to climate change could influence some key performance indicators (KPIs) identified for the marine park. Whilst it is recognised that climate change is not a pressure that is manageable within a marine reserve context, the plan still needs to recognise its potential impacts. There is also the need for data to enable assessment of its potential influence, provide context for the impacts of other pressures and make sure that ecological changes are attributed to the right cause(s) (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2d)	<p>In determining baselines and trends for the ecological values of the marine park, DEC will consider both the natural variability that is inherent in the system, human impacts and large scale ‘drivers’ such as climate change. However, potential pressure and impacts arising from climate change cannot be managed at the reserve scale. The monitoring program for this reserve and others within the state will nevertheless provide information for managers and an adaptive management approach is used for the State’s marine parks and reserves.</p>
12	<p>In the longer term, the likelihood of a marina at Cape Peron will bring greater boating populations; hence the need for offset planning at an early stage is critical to provide greater conservation values immediately alongside this planned development. This could create an economic advantage and help bring international tourists to the area/marina thus, accomplishing both development and conservation in a hand-in-glove manner. Taxes imposed, in a similar manner to Rottneest Island landing fees, might be re-channelled into maintaining the marine park for long-term continuous improvement and sustainability (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2c)	<p>The proposed marina development at Cape Peron is, at this stage, not within the marine park and is beyond the scope of the plan. However any new development proposals that have the potential to impact the marine park, including the proposed marina development at Mangles Bay, will be formally assessed by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) and DEC/MPRA, considering this plan and the requirements under the <i>Environment Protection Act 1986</i> (EP Act).</p>
13	<p>Our organisation requests clarification regarding which agency will be responsible for the future management of Tern Island and in particular, for the land located above the high water mark (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2c)	<p>Tern Island is a Class C Nature Reserve and is managed by DEC.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
14	We trust that this plan is not a 'fait accompli' and that our input will be noticed and acted upon (1 submission).	No (2d)	All submissions received were considered in the finalisation of the plan and assessed on their merit against the criteria for amendment.
15	Our organisation has been disappointed with the marine conservation strategy currently pursued by the MPRA/DEC. Our organisation has offered alternatives and compromises that we believe will provide tangible benefits to marine conservation with minimal impact on recreational fishers. These have unfortunately not been adopted in previous submission review process, but we are hopeful that our recommendations will be considered in this instance (1 submission).	No (2b)	All submissions received were considered in the finalisation of the plan and assessed on their merit against the criteria for amendment.
<b>Executive summary</b>			
16	I agree with protecting unique plants and animals, however this summary also should clearly spell out the fragile coastal environment e.g. sand dunes and habitats, which require protection from increasing use of the marine park (1 submission).	No (2d)	This section is meant to provide an overview of the document. Threats to the coastal habitats such as sand dunes, which are generally not within the marine park, are discussed in later sections of the plan.
<b>2. Management context</b>			
Responsibilities of authorities and government agencies			
17	Department of Industry and Resources (DoIR) is referenced in Table 1 however many DoIR activities are now looked after by National Offshore Petroleum Safety Authority (NOPSA) (1 submission).	No (2c)	NOPSA regulates worker safety and is not involved in the management or conservation of the marine environment.
18	Table 1 in the plan does not acknowledge the Department of Health (DoH) as the lead government agency with responsibility for public health and its integral role in seafood (safety for consumption), aquaculture, public health and recreational water quality within the marine park boundaries. Table 1 should be amended to reflect the DoH's role. DoH's routine monitoring of recreational water quality at beaches within the marine park boundaries is also not acknowledged (1 submission).	Yes (1e)	Table 1 has been amended to reflect the role of the DoH.
<b>3. Management framework</b>			

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Best practice management model			
19	<p>The KPI's as a "measure of the overall effectiveness" of management are not. In most cases marine park management have no control over these indicators, and it likely they will show changes occurring outside the marine park boundaries, as a result of externalities rather than human interactions within marine park boundaries. Care needs to be taken when choosing indicators to measure the things we actually want to know and to things that can be measured <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	No (2d)	<p>In determining baselines and trends for the ecological and social values that have been identified as KPIs, DEC will consider both the natural variability that is inherent in the system and changes that could be due to factors outside the marine park. This is the case for all marine parks where specific ecological values have a high degree of natural variability and the potential to be influenced by outside sources.</p>
20	<p>Section 3.1 of the plan states that the KPIs serve the following function:  <i>“Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are a measure of the overall effectiveness of the management in relation to the strategic objectives of the marine park. KPIs relate specifically to the management targets of the key ecological and social values and reflect the highest conservation (from biodiversity and ecosystem integrity perspectives) and management (social) priorities of the MPRA, DEC and the community. KPIs are key element of the MPRA audit process”.</i></p> <p>Given the importance given to the KPI in the decision-support system, considerable care needs to be taken in the selection of each indicator. There are at least five key questions concerning the selection of indicators as KPIs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the ecological / social model underpinning the selection of the indicator?</li> <li>2. Does the KPI integrate the potential effects of management strategies on the identified pressures or threats to the strategic objectives?</li> <li>3. Has a monitoring method and broad experimental design to service the KPI been identified in the plan?</li> <li>4. Is there, or will there be, a program of surveillance monitoring (within or outside the marine park) measuring the level of background variation in the indicator?</li> <li>5. What is the probability that the data requirements for the indicator will be adequately resourced?</li> </ol> <p>Five indicators were selected as KPIs in the plan; these are water and sediment quality, seagrass meadows, little penguin, finfish and seascapes. Interestingly the macro-algae communities, that are the dominant producers in this ecosystem, are not considered to have ecological values that requiring auditing with a KPI. Even the objectives for finfish have apparently been left for another time and another agency (Department of Fisheries (DoF)) <b>(1 submission)?</b></p>	No (2d)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. KPIs are a measure of the overall effectiveness of management in relation to the strategic objectives of the marine park. KPIs relate specifically to the management targets for key ecological and social values and reflect the highest conservation (from biodiversity and ecosystem integrity perspectives) and management (social) priorities of the MPRA, DEC and the community. KPIs are a key element of the MPRA audit process. The values of the marine park were prioritised and a risk assessment of the pressures on these values was completed. Macroalgae was not chosen as a KPI as it is highly responsive to change and therefore more resilient than other plants such as seagrass. The plan acknowledges the importance of macroalgae dominated reefs within the marine park.</li> <li>2. The performance assessment framework and its associated monitoring program assesses three components 1) condition (as measured against the management target), 2) pressures and 3) adequacy of management response.</li> <li>3. A marine science program will be progressively implemented to coordinate and help deliver the research and monitoring strategies of the plan as part of a statewide initiative to improve the delivery of</li> </ol>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
			<p>research and monitoring requirements within marine conservation reserves and inform adaptive management. A coordinated monitoring program will also be implemented that focuses on monitoring of key ecological and social values against their management targets.</p> <p>4. In determining baselines and trends for the ecological values of the marine park, DEC will consider both the natural variability that is inherent in the system, human impacts and other 'drivers' to change. The monitoring program for this reserve will consider this variability when determining the significance of changes against the targets.</p> <p>5. The Government provided additional funding for the metropolitan marine parks of \$105,000 for 2006/07, \$210,000 for 2007/08 with a further increase in 2008/09. A significant portion of these funds will be directed to the marine park, which enhances its current funding. As such, there is increased capacity to deliver appropriate research and monitoring.</p>
<b>Determining management priorities</b>			
21	Amend "inappropriate sewage disposal" to "inappropriate sewage disposal from vessels" ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Yes (1e)	Text amended.
<b>4. Regional perspective</b>			
<b>Bioregional setting</b>			
22	Figure 1, note misspelling of Rottnest ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Yes (1e)	Figure 1 has been amended.
<b>Oceanography</b>			
23	It would be useful to provide some idea of how often Warnbro Sound is connected to (i) Peel-Harvey estuary outflow, and (ii) the northern waters of the Sepia Depression off Shoalwater Bay and Cockburn Sound. In particular, clarify whether this occurs rarely (once a year), occasionally (several times a year), or frequently (every week), and in what seasons.	Yes (1e)	The conditions under which, and an indication of how often, the waters from the Peel-Harvey Estuary, the Sepia Depression Ocean Outfall and Cockburn Sound enter the marine park have been added to section 4.4

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	At present, there is no basis from which to decide if/whether these are viewed as serious pressures on the environment or not <b>(1 submission)</b> .		Oceanography.
<b>Social context</b>			
24	This section does not mention many recreational issues such as snorkelling, kayaking and surf kayaking which are enjoyed by many users <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2d)	This section does state that the area is a popular location for recreational activities including snorkelling and kayaking.
<b>5. Definition of the area and reserve tenure</b>			
25	The first paragraph should read ‘existing’ tenure, not ‘exiting tenure’ <b>(1 submission)</b> .	Yes (1e)	Text amended.
26	The plan states that “appropriate management of the whitebait population and the nearshore shallow habitats around Becher Point are critical to the ongoing survival of the little penguin population on Penguin Island” and “the shallow nearshore waters around Becher Point are regionally important as a habitat and nursery area for whitebait and other bait fish species.” Given the importance of this area for ecological sustainability whilst facing increased human pressure for fishing, consideration should be given to include some of the area within a Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation). This would also provide a ‘buffer’ zone for the Becher Point Sanctuary Zone which currently has minimal buffering capacity from the adjoining General Use Zone. The location of a proposed Becher Point Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation) would, however, need to be mindful of the current/proposed boat launching facilities and should not compromise the ability of boat movements from the area <b>(1 submission)</b> .	Yes (1e)	The regionally important habitat and nursery areas in the nearshore shallow habitats around Becher Point are not within the marine park and are therefore outside the scope of the plan. The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to bring the Port Kennedy exclusion area into the marine park within the first twelve months of the plan’s implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1. The inclusion of the Port Kennedy exclusion area will follow an appropriate public participation process.
27	Supports the inclusion of the Port Kennedy exclusion area into the marine park <b>(4 submissions)</b> . Submissions also provided one or more of the following comments regarding the inclusion of the Port Kennedy exclusion area into the marine park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With an appropriate zoning the area would encompass and protect a vital whitebait nursery area underpinning the food resources for the little penguin colony in Shoalwater Bay (2 subs).</li> <li>• With the removal of the marina, maintaining the exclusion area is no longer required and its retention is inappropriate (1 sub).</li> <li>• Since the marine park’s gazettal in 1990, the exclusion area has received a higher</li> </ul>	Yes (1e)	The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to bring the Port Kennedy exclusion area into the marine park within the first twelve months of the plan’s implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1. The inclusion of the Port Kennedy exclusion area will follow an appropriate public participation process.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
28	<p>recognition of environmental and ecological significance, particularly the seagrass beds which have recently been recognised as an important fish nursery area for a number of species including whitebait (1 sub).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our organisation supports incorporating the Port Kennedy exclusion area within the marine park in conjunction with agreement from relevant government agencies for progressing the proposed Port Kennedy launching ramp (1 sub).</li> </ul> <p>A current proposal for the Cape Peron Tourist Precinct seeks to relocate the existing boat launching facility near the Garden Island Causeway further west. If the project was to proceed, it would place the proposed boat launching facility within the marine park. Such a facility would require the construction of ramps and jetties, possibly a breakwater and may necessitate dredging to achieve the required depth of water. This facility, either in its current location outside the marine park or in the proposed location inside the marine park, is considered to be of high strategic value to Perth's recreational boating community. Our organisation would not support the current Cape Peron Tourist Precinct proposal without an improved and expanded boat launching facility at Cape Peron. It is therefore considered prudent to excise from the marine park, the area proposed for the boat launching facility (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2e)	<p>The Cape Peron Tourism Precinct proposal is not within the marine park and therefore outside the scope of the plan. Any new development proposals that impact the marine park will be formally assessed by the EPA and DEC/MPRA, considering this plan and the requirements under the EP Act. In addition, changes to the boundary of the marine park have been considered and the recommendation of the plan is to not reduce the area of the marine park.</p>
29	<p>The specific issue we would like to comment on is the proposed north eastern boundary for the marine park, which extends to the causeway between the mainland and Garden Island. This area is classified as a General Use Zone where the conservation of natural values is a priority purpose of the zone, but various activities are allowed as long as they do not compromise the ecological values of the marine park. Our organisation is concerned that it will be difficult to meet the Water and Sediment Quality KPI (Section 9.1.2, p33) at this boundary due to the relatively poor flushing capacity in the area, particularly when considering the various activities currently occurring in and around this location. It is inevitable that waters derived from Cockburn Sound will flow across this boundary into the marine park. Discharge from the Cape Peron outlet, which discharges advanced secondary treated wastewater from Woodman Point Wastewater Treatment Plant as well as industry wastewater, may also flow into the marine park under certain climatic conditions. Our organisation recommends that the northern boundary be reconsidered in light of these issues, and relocated to an area south of Cape Peron (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2e)	<p>Changes to the boundary of the marine park have been considered and the recommendation of the plan is not to reduce the area of the marine park. In addition, when DEC determines the baseline and trends for water and sediment quality they will consider both the natural variability that is inherent in the system and changes that could be due to outside factors.</p>
30	<p>When the Ocean Reef outfall was included in Marmion Marine Park it lead to increased public scrutiny, ongoing questions about what “a sewage pipeline is doing in a marine</p>	No (2d)	<p>Any proposal to extend the marine park boundaries will follow appropriate stakeholder and agency consultation</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>park”, and unhelpful perceptions about CALM (now DEC) and our organisation alike. The fact the Marmion Marine Park boundary was deliberately placed around an existing outlet is invariably forgotten. A high priority strategy of the plan is initiating the statutory process to extend the present marine park boundary. The proposed extension, which is consistent with ‘A Representative Marine Reserve System for Western Australia’ (CALM 1994), involves extending the marine park boundary seaward to the limit of the State Territorial Sea, the western side of Garden Island and Carnac Island. Appendix II in the plan indicates an expectation of extending the marine park boundary by 2010. Should either or both these amendments take place there will be considerable implications to our organisation. Amending the marine park boundary to include the Port Kennedy exclusion area will include a potential intake site for Perth’s second proposed desalination plant (Desal 2). It would also result in the Sepia Depression outfall being located within the marine park. Discharge from the present Sepia Depression Ocean Outfall, the present outfall for Perth’s existing desalination plant (Desal 1) and potential outfalls for Desal 2 are not located within the present boundary of the marine park. Thus there will be no present or future discharge of treated wastewater (TWW) and/or brine directly into the waters of the existing marine park. Initial mixing and subsequent advection and dispersion of TWW/brine will also result in considerable dilution before it reaches the nearest of the present marine park boundaries, and at least 0.8-2.0 km of waters in the General Use Zone will have to be traversed before reaching the proposed locations of the more highly protected Sanctuary Zones and Special Purpose Zones. If and when the present marine park boundary is amended, it would result in the Sepia Depression outfall being encompassed within the marine park. This would necessitate special zoning to allow the outfall to operate. If and when the Port Kennedy exclusion area is included within the marine park boundary, it would encompass a potential intake site for the proposed Desal 2. The future construction of any proposed intake will not be precluded if the Port Kennedy exclusion area is zoned ‘General Use’, but may be if other zoning is applied. It is noted that amending the marine park boundary will be a separate process to the present process of reviewing and finalising the plan. Further, this process will require considerable consultation, and the tabling of an order in both Houses of Parliament (with no certainty of outcome). As the proposed marine park boundary amendments will have considerable strategic significance to our organisation, it is imperative that it is acknowledged as a key stakeholder in the consultation process, and included in any future steering/focus group that oversees the process (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>		<p>and a public participation process.</p>
<p><b>7.1.1 Development of a zoning scheme</b></p>			



No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
31	We need to also have periods when the area is 'no go' to leave the animals and nature in peace. Why can't we get more into the idea of passive recreation and learn to leave a bit of nature for nature itself. We need to teach people to get away from the idea of take, take, take and consume, consume, consume whatever is in sight. I think we should be getting away from the mentality of 'zones that have been located to minimise the impact on important recreational and commercial fishing areas' and thinking more along the lines of minimising the impact on flora and fauna ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2e)	The use of 'no go' areas are not considered necessary as the use of sanctuary, special purpose and general use zones in addition to the suite of management strategies will be used to achieve the conservation objectives of the marine park. Monitoring of key ecological values will be undertaken to help determine if the conservation outcomes are being achieved.
32	There are 12,000 km of coastline. Huge swathes of this should be protected, perhaps with a rotation system so that each zone is given many years to regenerate before again being harvested ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2c)	Rotational zoning of areas could be used as a fisheries management tool to maximise fisheries resources but does not offer long-term protection to all biodiversity.
<b>7.1.2 Zones in the Shoalwater Islands Marine Park</b>			
General comments			
33	Figure 3 shows the location of proposed zones for the marine park and is therefore assumed to be 'The Plan', however it also shows existing features that are proposed to be removed following endorsement/finalisation of the plan i.e. the gazetted Shoalwater Bay water ski area and the Port Kennedy exclusion area. This makes the map misleading and it is suggested that two maps be included in the plan, one for current/existing features and one for the proposed final plan. In addition, more maps, for example the current fishing areas/mussel farms and/or proposed fishing exclusion zones (including the dive wreck) would be beneficial to visually understand the multiple uses of the park and to determine the proposed loss of commercial/recreational fishing area ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Yes (1e)	Figure 3 has been reviewed and updated to reflect the accurate zoning and key management areas e.g. water ski areas. The suggestion to include additional maps to help clarify intent will be considered for future planning processes.
34	The fishing industry is generally very supportive of the zoning proposed in the plan ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
35	The plan has a good balance of sanctuary and use areas ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
36	Would like to see the entire marine park zoned a sanctuary zone ( <b>4 submissions</b> ). In support of the above statement, submissions provided one or more of the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the marine park was zoned a sanctuary zone, it would protect fish nurseries/penguins/Australian sea lions/ habitats (3 subs).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	Declaring the entire marine park a sanctuary zone would be inconsistent with the statutory purpose of marine parks; they are intended to provide for recreational and other uses consistent with the primary conservation objective and the Government's multiple-use policy. It

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fisherfolk have many miles of coastline in which to fish for commercial and recreational purposes (1 sub).</li> <li>The Rockingham Shire has a population of tens of thousands. To sustain a healthy and flourishing marine environment, access to the marine park (other than passive recreation and boat tours) needs to be heavily restricted (1 sub).</li> <li>Expressed concern regarding the future of the area (1 sub).</li> </ul>		<p>would thus not represent a balanced outcome and would have an unacceptable impact on other uses in the area, such as local commercial and recreational fishing.</p>
37	<p>There should be a strong emphasis on 'sanctuary' for the whole area, with sanctuary zones dominating the zoning for the area. Have a continuous sanctuary zone from Cape Peron (beginning at the Garden Island Causeway) south to Becher Point i.e. not isolated areas. General Use Zone should only be within Warnbro Sound. There should only be two zonings for the area, general use and sanctuary, clearly defined on a map and easily understood by the public, not complex (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2e)	<p>Extending the zones as suggested would have an unacceptable impact on other uses in the area such as local commercial and recreational fishing and would be inconsistent with the Government's multiple-use policy.</p>
38	<p>Conservation should be the prime importance of the area; all activities should be able to co-exist with conservation (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2b)	<p>As per the CALM Act the primary purpose of marine parks is conservation.</p>
39	<p>Blasting in special purpose zones would be totally unacceptable at anytime for any reason due to damage done to the reef structures, flora and fauna (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	Yes (1e)	<p>Table 3 has been amended to clarify that blasting, which is an activity that would be undertaken as part of a major infrastructure and development project, is not permitted in the marine park's special purpose zones. This is consistent with the long-term targets for geomorphology, as specified in Section 9.1.1.</p>
40	<p>Mineral/petroleum development should not be permitted in any zone. The idea of this, and any commercial fishing activity, makes the word 'sanctuary' an oxymoron (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2f)	<p>Table 3 has been updated to reflect DEC's intention regarding mineral/petroleum exploration and development in the sanctuary and special purpose zones. However mining and mineral extraction is managed under other State legislation and changes to legislation are outside the scope of this plan.</p>
41	<p>It is interesting to note that mineral and petroleum exploration and development and blasting are permitted in the General Use Zone but there is no mention of treated wastewater disposal as a valid social use. Should our organisation not collect, treat and dispose of the wastewater generated by Perth's homes and businesses, the implications to the environment and to public health would be severe, yet this fact is frequently overlooked. Another fact</p>	No (2d)	<p>Major infrastructure and development projects, such as the disposal of treated wastewater, are covered in the 'Structure and Development' section of Table 2.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
42	<p>that is frequently overlooked is that even with full recycling of wastewater there will be a need for (carefully sited and managed) ocean disposal, as 20-25% of the original volume of wastewater will be left as a concentrate that contains most of the substances originally present in the wastewater. Table 2 should identify treated wastewater disposal as a valid social use <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p> <p>Does allowing boating, kayaking etc within the vicinity of Seal Island maintain adequate levels of protection for the sea lion communities using the island as a haul out location? Should a 50m exclusion zone around the island be imposed (refer Table 2) <b>(1 submission)</b>?</p>	No (2d)	Currently kayaks and small boats can not land or approach within 5 metres of the beach on Seal Island. No further restrictions are deemed necessary at this stage. However, monitoring of the Australian sea lion population of the central west coast is being undertaken and additional management responses can be implemented if necessary.
43	<p>The zoning will affect many of our members who enjoy taking their boats out fishing but all have reached the same conclusion, it will be well worth it for the sake of our children and future generations. We would like to see people come to realise the ecological values of the marine park and respect the marine creatures. When tourists visit they can also enjoy the humpback and southern right whales that migrate through the marine park at certain times of the year. The marine park is a small gem in the Rockingham area, there should be more protected areas like this in WA <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
44	<p>I wish to lodge a protest against the establishment of sanctuary zones within the marine park. Although I think it is an excellent idea to preserve the environment for generations to come I believe the creation of zones will do nothing to preserve the environment and fish stocks. Creating zones will not enhance the fish stocks and it is my belief that this zone is being established solely for the benefit of the tourist trade. It could be said that recreational fishermen are seen as an eyesore to the tourists. It should be borne in mind that these fishermen are not there all day everyday and if fishermen are present at the time of tours then the tour guides should put their patrons minds at ease by explaining how the environment and fish stocks are being monitored and cared for with ample stocks of fish in existence. Should my suggestions on how the protection of fish stocks be adopted then this could also be pointed out to their patrons. Perhaps a short training course based along these lines would not go astray. If this is the real reason for sanctuary zones then it is wrong to use the environment and as a tool to achieve this aim. Perhaps you could employ the services of a shore-based resident in Arcadia Drive to monitor the number and position of fishing boats</p>	No (2e)	The conservation measures proposed in the plan, particularly the sanctuary zones, are not designed to preferentially benefit the tourism industry to the detriment of other social uses, or solely to protect particular fish stocks. Sanctuary zones aim to help conserve all biodiversity, not just fish. Management of herring stocks are the responsibility of DoF.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>active within Shoalwater Bay. I feel sure that this would prove the area is not being overfished. I have fished in Shoalwater Bay for many years and have not noticed any deterioration in fish stocks. The seals, little penguins and wildlife etc are still there in full abundance and would have taken off long ago should stocks have diminished. The only deterioration in seagrass is as a result of a land mass extension in front of the Safety Bay yacht club. I am 70 years old and really enjoy my fishing. We are constantly being told to "get out there and do it" for our own enjoyment and to keep healthy and thus reduce the burden on the health system. I do not wish to have restrictions placed upon me as to where I can fish. If these restrictions were to take place I may be forced to venture beyond the safe confines of Shoalwater Bay. To fish on the western side of the Murray Reefs is not as safe and I would prefer to leave this to the younger, more agile generation. Should these restrictions be introduced, consideration could be given to allowing the older generation to continue to enjoy handline or rod fishing anywhere within the confines of marine park. I realise these sanctuary zones represent only a small percentage of the marine park but their locations are where I enjoy fishing for herring. I have tried many areas within the marine park without the same success. I feel that it is wrong to say there are plenty of other areas within the marine park to catch fish. It really hurts me and I feel upset when cleaning a herring and I find it full of roe. I have no idea at the time of catching such a fish it is in roe. Just one of these fish probably produces enough herring for all the fish I would catch for a very long time. The way to prevent this from happening is to do a study (if not already done) on when the herring are in roe along the South and West Coasts. Once known then apply a 'closed season' which will help allow for maximum productivity. As the herring is a pelagic fish and travels from East to West along the coast as part of its life cycle, the way to allow a greater number of fish to take part in this cycle is to reduce the amount of net fishing done by professional fishermen along the South and South West Coasts, thus ensuring a much greater number to take part. After all a percentage of this catch is used for bait or pet food and as there are various other sources to satisfy these demands it seems an abuse of herring stock. Their catch should be sufficient to supply the local market for those people who cannot or do not want to catch fish. As the human population continues to grow with an ever increasing number of recreational fishermen putting boats on the water, the natural production of herring stock will find it difficult to keep up with human demand. The only additional way I can see to improve herring stock is by means of aquaculture. I feel that the DoF is lagging behind and should be performing a much larger role in this area. The time to start intensive aquaculture of the herring species was yesterday and not to delay to the point where the damage is done and recovery of the situation is very difficult if not impossible. Maybe because the humble herring is so plentiful by comparison to other fish stocks and</p>		

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
45	<p>considered as a table fish it has been neglected (<b>1 submission</b>).</p> <p>No attempt has been made to incorporate representative marine habitats in a sustainable way. The area designated for 'sanctuary zones' is wholly inadequate. A marine park needs to support all marine habitats allowing evolving biodiversity and ensuring the higher level of protection to all species. The natural structure of communities needs the marine life (including algae) on the boundary reefs (the Rocks etc) as well as seagrass meadows. There has to be a sanctuary zone over the whole of the marine park. The main reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A future population of 250,000 citizens (Rockingham Shire) is predicted. Allowing activities other than those listed under 'sanctuary zone' will decimate the marine environment because of population pressure. Buffer zones will not be readily accepted/understood by the general public and will require constant monitoring.</li> <li>2. Climate, geological change and human interference (dredging, mining) cannot be predicted. A consequence may be the dispersal of marine communities, or their habitat change. Sand shift and alteration of sea levels can cause the relocation of marine communities anywhere within the marine park. Therefore, the need for the entire marine park to be zoned 'sanctuary'.</li> <li>3. Different ecosystems outside the designated sanctuary zones are not protected. Seagrass meadows (the nursery and habitat for marine species) are vulnerable. The boundary reef (Rocks and The Sisters) sustain marine animals and plants which have an influence on the development on natural community structures within the marine park. Bird Island, Penguin Island and Tern Island are in need of added protection.</li> <li>4. The movement of little penguins extends to Warnbro Sound. Boat and wind/kite surfing can result in penguin kills.</li> <li>5. Cape Peron is under threat from development as a marine/housing/commercial project. The impact of massive ground works, boats, people and pollution cannot be effectively managed to prevent the destruction of the marine park's marine environment. In general (assuming there is no marina built), Cape Peron has unique value as a marine schoolroom. Its tranquil beauty should be conserved at all costs (<b>1 submission</b>).</li> </ol>	No (2e)	<p>Declaring the entire marine park a sanctuary zone would be inconsistent with the statutory purpose of marine parks; they are intended to provide for recreational and other uses consistent with the primary conservation objective and the Government's multiple-use policy. It would thus not represent a balanced outcome, and would have an unacceptable impact on other uses in the area such as local commercial and recreational fishing.</p>
46	<p>The zoning scheme as it currently stands will not meet the comprehensive, adequate or representative (CAR) objectives for marine reserves. The sanctuary zones are not comprehensively representative (most coverage is for seagrass habitat/sand), cover little of the park (30% is considered an adequate proportion, you have 6%) and thus do not appear to be fulfilling a strategic conservation objective. It is clear that the zones proposed for the</p>	No (2e)	<p>The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>marine park are not going to accomplish the protection of the 'ecological values' outlined in the plan. To do this you would need to 'work backwards' by clearly stating a measurable conservation objective and manipulating the zoning to ensure that this is achieved. If the objective is aligned with the CAR system, then zoning for recreational and commercial interests needs to be planned around the sanctuary zones which have been allocated for scientific reasons, not through placing lines on a map in the public consultation process. This leaves the conservation estate with little more than areas which have no value to these interests, and consequently little value for conservation either <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>		<p>scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park. The plan also contains a high priority strategy to commence the planning process to further consider a sanctuary zone off Cape Peron within the first year following gazettal of the plan.</p>
47	<p>It is quite obvious that Shoalwater Bay should be kept for recreational use only. It is one of the few places on the coast to swim, fish and sail with safety. No commercial activity should be allowed. Please keep it for the people of WA and you will find that our appreciation will be very evident <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	No (2e)	<p>Prohibiting commercial activities in Shoalwater Bay would not represent a balanced outcome, and would have an unacceptable impact on the valid commercial uses that occur in the area.</p>
48	<p>The gazetted water ski area in Shoalwater Bay is not accurately shown within the plan.</p>	Yes (1e)	<p>The plan incorrectly depicted the Shoalwater Bay waterski area (figure 3). This has been corrected in the final plan.</p>
49	<p>There are a number of gazetted areas under the Navigable Waters Regulations within the marine park. Our organisation has provided following comments regarding these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation) in Shoalwater Bay has been placed over a ski area gazetted by Department for Planning and Infrastructure (DPI).</li> <li>• Location of the Becher Point Sanctuary Zone also imposes on the Warnbro Sound Ski Area.</li> </ul> <p><b>(1 submission)</b></p>	No (2d)	<p>Legislation does not prohibit a gazetted waterski area and a management zone for a marine park overlapping or existing in the same location.</p>
50	<p>The proportion of coastal waters in sanctuary zones within 100km of the metropolitan area is minute. The greater metropolitan area is where most people live, and where there is enormous interest in having healthy marine life. Let Perth be an example to the rest of Australia <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	No (2e)	<p>The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
51	<p>I believe there is, under the proposal, the capacity to link various zones and increase the overall areas of each whilst maintaining interconnectedness so that recreational or professional activities do not impact or disrupt natural processes between zones. There is much more to be gained by having a larger area under protection in the first instance, so that there is a greater margin for the recovery of fish stocks and that natural human pressure do not further strain the marine environment in this particular area any more than necessary. It is important to recognise the productive value of the open ocean/windward side of the extended reef system and give this much more protection than is currently afforded to it under the proposal as it stands <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	No (2e)	<p>The plan also contains a high priority strategy to commence the planning process to further consider a sanctuary zone off Cape Peron within the first year following gazettal of the plan.</p> <p>The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park. The plan also contains a high priority strategy to commence the planning process to further consider a sanctuary zone off Cape Peron within the first year following gazettal of the plan.</p>
52	<p>Submission supported a sanctuary zones at one or more of the following alternative locations<b>(3 submissions)</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Penguin Island. (3 subs)</li> <li>• Bird Island. (1 sub)</li> </ul>	No (2d)	<p>Sanctuary zones were considered in alternative locations, however the locations in the plan are considered the best outcome after considering all viewpoints on the issue.</p>
53	<p>The plan appears to be heavily focused on social and commercial uses of the marine park with only 6% of the area secured in sanctuary zones. This does not provide a high level of protection to the conservation values of the marine park and should be further considered. Our organisation believes that the zones as shown restrict the capacity of the marine park to regenerate fish stocks and it is recommended that the extent and alignment of these zones be reviewed in order to maximise their potential benefits and to assist in the future policing of boat owner behaviour within the marine park. Furthermore, to maximise their effectiveness as conservation zones, it is suggested that increasing the size of the existing marked sanctuary zones, as opposed to identifying a number of smaller, isolated zones will be easier to identify and manage and will likely have a higher ecological value than a number of smaller areas <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>		<p>The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park. The plan also contains a high priority strategy to commence the planning process to further consider a sanctuary zone off Cape Peron within the first year</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
54	Call 'sanctuary zones' 'regeneration zones'. The word 'sanctuary' is less acceptable than 'Regeneration Zone'. 'Sanctuary' suggests a place for short term escape. The concept of 'Regeneration zones' is difficult to reject <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2f)	following gazettal of the plan.  The term sanctuary zone is specified in legislation. The term 'sanctuary' is a commonly used term in marine protected area planning worldwide and thus the public tend to identify with and understand the term.
55	With reference to the sanctuary zones within the marine park, has any scientific study been done to indicate that the proposed levels of fishing will not impact on the ecological balance and negatively affect populations e.g. of little penguins and sea lions? Could this be incompatible with the stated aims, namely a better marine life in 2027 than currently <b>(1 submission)</b> ?		The management plan applies a zoning scheme that includes highly protected areas such as sanctuary zones, as well as a suite of management strategies and collaborative work with DoF to achieve conservation and sustainable use objectives. Monitoring of key ecological values, such as finfish, will help determine if the stated objectives are being achieved or if additional management responses are required.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Seal Island Sanctuary Zone				
<b>Submitters ticked "support" on the submission form</b>				
56	Individuals supported the zone but provided no additional comment <b>(32 submissions)</b> .		No (2a)	Support for the plan.
57	Limited or no fishing and banning of water skiing <b>(1 submission)</b> .	To allow better breeding stocks of fish and to allow for a safer environment for those wishing to swim, especially SCUBA diving and snorkelling.	No (2a)	Fishing is not allowed within sanctuary zones. An 8 knot speed limit will apply in this zone from 1 July 2008.
58	Zone should be made larger <b>(4 submissions)</b> .	The submissions also provided one or more of the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To make sure there is ample and safe feeding grounds and to increase feeding stocks for sea lions, penguins, seabirds, pelicans and the visiting</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed.



No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Seal Island Sanctuary Zone				
59	We support the zoning scheme (1 submission).	<p>dolphins (1 sub).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature is vulnerable so it is about time we thought from its perspective and not our own and make it a true sanctuary zone. Let children grow up with this concept instead of continually seeing nature as only to fill their bellies. Nature needs all it can get (1 sub).</li> <li>Seals don't only live in the restricted sanctuary zone. Fishing line and hooks etc aren't compatible with seals. World wide experience has shown the bigger a sanctuary zone the more biodiversity and longer term viability it protects and provides for (1 sub).</li> </ul> <p>The area does need a high level of protection from those that would purposely damage the marine life or habitat. The marine life, as well as areas used for scientific purposes, should be protected for future generations.</p>	No (2a)	<p>The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.</p> <p>Support for the plan.</p>
60	The table of uses permitted should note that landing is not permitted. Limited approach to 50 meters of the beach. Prohibited wildlife interaction (1 submission).	Minimise disturbance so as not to drive seals away. I only saw six this year.	Yes (1e)	The restrictions governing access to Seal Island has been added to the section on the Seal Island Sanctuary Zone. Marine mammal interactions are addressed in the <i>Wildlife Conservation (Close Season for Marine Mammals) Notice 1998</i> and are not within the scope of the plan.
61	A greater emphasis on conservation (1 submission).	This will ensure fish stocks and enhance the opportunities for the surrounding areas.	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Seal Island Sanctuary Zone				
				and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
<b>Submitters ticked “would support if changes were made” on the submission form</b>				
62	Individuals supported the zone with changes but provided no additional comment (1 submission).		No (2b)	No change sought.
63	Zone should be made larger (5 submissions). Submissions also provided one or more of the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would like the regulations that govern their use made stricter (1 sub).</li> <li>Incorporate the General Use Zone as all one sanctuary zone (1 sub).</li> <li>Join Seal Island Sanctuary Zone and Second Rock Sanctuary Zone (1 sub).</li> </ul>	The submissions provided one or more of the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The limitations of the zoning scheme listed on your page 23 should be addressed. The sanctuary zones are generally too small and do little to protect the natural environment. The area must be significantly large enough to enable an ecosystem return along with the complexities of the interdependencies inherent in it (4 subs).</li> <li>Recreational activities from an increased population will destroy the marine communities (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
64	The boundaries of the zone should be rationalised for ease of identification, management and enforcement issues (1 submission).	The northern and western boundaries of the Seal Island Sanctuary Zone should be squared off and aligned with the Wildlife Conservation Special Purpose Zone boundary (on the western side).	No (2d)	Zones will be clearly demarcated in the field once the zoning scheme has been gazetted.
65	The zone should favour the seaward side of the islands (Seal and Shag) as apposed to the leeward (1 submission).	The seaward side is more prolific with marine life and is therefore more important to sea lions and dolphins.	No (2d)	This suggestion may be considered in future reviews of the zoning scheme. However, the arrangement presented in the plan is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after considering all viewpoints.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Seal Island Sanctuary Zone</b>				
66	Remove permissions for moorings (2 <b>submission</b> ).	Potential bottom impact.	No (2d)	DEC is developing a mooring plan that will manage the potential impact and siting of moorings within the marine park.
67	Reduce the zone to 200 meters around the islands (1 <b>submission</b> ).	I have fished there for the past 15 years in a 10 foot dinghy in safety and wish to continue.	No (2e)	Reducing the sanctuary zones to 200m around the islands will not provide adequate protection for the biodiversity of the marine park.
68	Commercial fisherman treated exactly the same and recreational fishermen. No commercial lobster fishing (1 <b>submission</b> ).	Recreational fishermen are limited in the number of fish and rock lobsters they can take whereas commercial fishermen have carte blanche. Commercial fishermen are able to take what is in pots vs. recreational quotas.	No (2c)	The DoF manages fishing in all State waters, including in marine conservation reserves.
69	Extended to the north of Seal Island to make a rectangle (1 <b>submission</b> ).	There is a very large cave system under the reef 200 m north of Seal Island full of fish and invertebrates.	No (2d)	This area was considered for inclusion in the sanctuary zone during the focus group and planning processes. The area is highly valued by the commercial and recreational fishing sectors.
70	No anchoring should be allowed (2 <b>submissions</b> ).	Anchoring will disturb marine life too much as the area becomes more popular for boating and recreational activities.	Yes (1e)	The plan now contains a strategy that specifies that restrictions on anchoring to protect vulnerable communities or locations, such as seagrass meadows, can be applied if deemed necessary in the future.
71	No charter vessels, swimming, diving, snorkelling, wildlife interaction, sailing boats and/or windsurfing (3 <b>submissions</b> ).	To ensure that there is no human contact and to ensure the true meaning of 'sanctuary'. Increases in tourist numbers puts seals at risk, a spoiled environment puts tourism at risk.	No (2e)	Removing the listed activities would be inconsistent with the statutory purpose of marine parks; they are intended to provide for recreational and other uses consistent with the primary conservation objective and the Government's multiple-use policy. It would thus not represent a balanced outcome.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Seal Island Sanctuary Zone				
72	Would prefer exclusion zone around islands for all boats ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Decrease impact on sea lion population.	No (2d)	Seal Island is the main haul-out site within the marine park and to protect Australian sea lions, access to the island is already prohibited, and individuals may not approach within 5 m of the shore. Additional restrictions could be applied in future if deemed necessary.
73	Allow paddlers access to islands ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Allow for close up interaction with environment.	No (2c)	The Shoalwater Islands are managed by the <i>Shoalwater Islands Management Plan 1992-2002</i> and access to the islands is prohibited to provide protection for Australian sea lions and nesting sea and shorebirds. Changes to the island plan are not within the scope of this plan.
74	Our organisation suggests moving the eastern boundary 500 meters to the west to accommodate this important group of recreational fishers ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	The sand bank running from Seal Island eastwards is a popular fishing location for families and the elderly in small boats for bread and butter species such as whiting and herring. The proposed sanctuary zone may force many of these fishers into areas exposed to south-westerly winds and swell outside the protection of Seal Island. The plan lists an objective of the proposed sanctuary zone as providing a buffer between Seal Island, which is an important Australian sea lion haul-out area, and commercial and recreational fishing area. Our organisation is not aware of any evidence that recreational fishing in the area has directly impacted on the Australian sea lion colony or indirectly by competing for food supply. Our organisation requests scientific evidence to support such a claim if to be used as justification for the exclusion of recreational fishers. The plan mentions the protection of important seagrass meadows, intertidal reef and subtidal macroalgae dominated reef	No (2e)	The primary purpose of the zone is to provide protection for marine biodiversity including representative seagrass, intertidal and subtidal reef habitats. It will also help minimise disturbance to Australian sea lions. Reconfiguring the zone to allow for recreational fishing to take place from the sand bar was considered by the Focus Group, however it was decided that the current configuration was the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints. The plan now contains a strategy that specifies that restrictions on anchoring to protect vulnerable communities or locations, such as seagrass meadows, can be applied if deemed necessary in the future.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Seal Island Sanctuary Zone</b>				
		communities as a need for the sanctuary zone. For this to be a realistic goal an anchoring management plan should also be implemented.		
<b>Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form</b>				
75	Individuals did not support the zone but provided no additional comment (1 submission).		No (2b)	No change sought.
76	Recreational shore based fishing (1 submission).	Recreational fishing has no detrimental effect.	No (2d)	The primary purpose of the zone is to provide protection for marine biodiversity including representative seagrass, intertidal and subtidal reef habitats. Scientific evidence has shown that recreational fishing can have an effect on marine biodiversity. Access to the shoreline is also prohibited under the <i>Shoalwater Islands Management Plan 1992-2002</i> .
77	The idea of making 7/8 on the distance to the mainland a sanctuary is going to make it very unfair on the few kayakers, boaties and the ferry when they make the round trip with a party of sightseers as the part nearest the mainland is a sand bar, almost reaching halfway across (1 submission).	Firstly the twenty male sea lions have lived there since I was young and my kids used to feed them chocolate. Although things were different then since people used to swim and play with them, but not now as they are 5 metres off limits, as is Seal Island. People still like to paddle past and observe them as they sunbathe on the beach; it is a case of being at one with nature. It isn't as though the sea lions are being disturbed while on a breeding program, as it's the male colony returned from mating up north and are just having some respite.	No (2d)	The zone does not prohibit vessels from anchoring or transiting the zone and users can engage in passive non-extractive activities such as swimming, snorkelling and nature appreciation.
78	Recreational rock lobster and rod/line fishing must be maintained in the sanctuary zone (1 submission).	The zone is a special place for all to enjoy.	No (2e)	The primary purpose of the zone is to provide protection for marine biodiversity including representative seagrass, intertidal and subtidal reef habitats. Allowing fishing within a sanctuary zone is inconsistent with the statutory

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Seal Island Sanctuary Zone				
79	I wish to lodge a protest against the establishment of sanctuary zones ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Although I think it is an excellent idea to preserve the environment for generations to come, creating a zone around Seal Island will not enhance the fish stocks and it is my belief that this zone is being established solely for the benefit of the tourist trade.	No (2e)	purpose of the zone.  The conservation measures proposed in the plan, particularly the sanctuary zones, are not designed to preferentially benefit the tourism industry to the detriment of other social uses, or solely to protect particular fish stocks. Sanctuary zones aim to help conserve all biodiversity, not just fish.
80	The sanctuary zone is too large ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	It impinges on recreational fishing.	No (2e)	The primary purpose of the zone is to provide protection for marine biodiversity including representative seagrass, intertidal and subtidal reef habitats. Other areas within the marine park are available for recreational fishing.
81	The proposed sanctuary zone should be shifted south with its northern boundary extending west from the McLarty Road boat launching area and its southern boundary extending west from Mersey Point. Its eastern boundary would be the shoreline and the western boundary would be western boundary of the proposed Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone. This alternative area would include 1. substantial shoreline (mainland and Penguin Island) that is not otherwise represented in sanctuary zones; 2. a large continuous area of seagrass meadow that has high species diversity; 3. it is in need of protection due to informal recreational specimen collecting;	1. Pulling rock lobster pots from small boats can be hazardous due to moderate swell. Typically, you pull your pot with have your back to the swell and small boats are in danger of being capsized by swell arriving at the wrong moment. The area around and between Seal Island and Shag Rock is protected from the prevailing condition, creating an area where rock lobster fishing from small boats can be safely undertaken. All other inshore areas between Cape Peron and Becher Point are more exposed to the prevailing swell and if the zone proceeds it will displace fishers to more hazardous locations. The same area is also safe for the taking of rock lobsters by diving, especially those only using snorkels. 2. The sand bank running from Seal Island eastwards is a reliable source of King George whiting (and occasionally herring) and is protected from the	No (2e)	The primary purpose of the zone is to provide protection for marine biodiversity including representative seagrass, intertidal and subtidal reef habitats. Reconfiguring the zone to allow for recreational fishing to take place from the sand bar was considered by the Focus Group, however it was decided that the current configuration was the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Seal Island Sanctuary Zone				
	<p>4. there is only modest recreational fishing in the area and almost no beach fishing;</p> <p>5. dolphins, sea lions, sting rays and penguins are prevalent;</p> <p>6. the area is accessible from land, without the need to access commercial tourism operators, for snorkelling and other means of nature observation;</p> <p>7. it is an important hatchery area for many species of fish;</p> <p>8. it is an important food supply for various sea birds.</p> <p><b>(1 submission)</b></p>	<p>prevailing conditions. This is a low cost option for fishers with limited resources. Other local protected areas are usually unproductive. If the zone proceeds, fishers will be forced into exposed areas with an increase in boating hazard. Fishers also wade out onto the sand bank and fish from waist deep water. The only other location where this is possible is the sand bank between Penguin Island and Mersey Point, which is dangerous due to the rips and swell and conflicts with people wading to Penguin Island and boats crossing the sand bar.</p> <p>3. Shoalwater Bay is used by a considerable number of fishers who use locally launched small open boats with low-capacity outboard motors. The zone represents a significant reduction in safe recreational fishing opportunities for residents of Shoalwater and Safety Bay using small boats. If the zone proceeds it will displace some fishing activities into other areas, lead some fishers to increase the size of their boats and motors so they can fish in other areas, and therefore put pressure on other areas and ramp facilities.</p> <p>4. The plan states that the zone includes various types of habitat however it includes only modest areas of seagrass meadows and almost no area of intertidal reef. The proposed Second Rock Sanctuary Zone includes more substantial areas of subtidal macroalgae dominated reef.</p> <p>5. The plan states the zone has value for scientific monitoring, however by declaring it a sanctuary zone it may interfere with valid scientific conclusions if a change in the management regime for the area is instituted. If banning recreational</p>		

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Seal Island Sanctuary Zone				
		<p>fishing (which is the only effective change in the regime) has an impact on water quality it may mask effects caused by Cockburn Sound activities.</p> <p>6. Although the area is important for birds and Australian sea lions, recreational fishing has minimal impact on the sea lion colony. I am not aware of any evidence that fishing in the area has an impact on the food supply for the sea lions and recreational fishers rarely encounter them. Of more concern is the close approach by commercial and informal tourist boats to the colony while the sea lions rest on the beach. As DEC has determined that the current level of tourism activity is not harmful and proposed to permit it to continue it is difficult to see that the less intrusive recreational fishing activity is a problem. The same can be said in relation to bird nesting activities.</p> <p>7. The plan states that the sanctuary zone will enhance the value of the marine park waters for tourism, recreational diving and nature observation. However, why will the banning of recreational fishing “enhance the value of the park waters for these activities”? Commercial tourism, recreational diving and nature observation are likely to have a more adverse impact on the sea lion colony than recreational fishing and could have the same effects on the scientific reference aspects of the area as recreational fishing. It is self contradictory and hypercritical to include such a factor along with others mentioned.</p> <p>8. The plan states that in recognition of the commercial and recreational fishing values areas</p>		



No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Seal Island Sanctuary Zone				
		<p>important areas to the north, south, east and west have been excluded. While areas to the east and west have been excluded it is a notable failure of the sanctuary zone system that it does not include any at all deep water reefs (which the commercial rock lobster fishers use), or any areas adjacent to land. As to the areas to the north and south of the zone, in my experience of 20 years recreational fishing in Shoalwater Bay, they are inferior areas not taking into account other factors such as comfort and safety.</p>		

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Second Rock Sanctuary Zone				
<b>Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form</b>				
82	Individuals supported the zone but provided no additional comment ( <b>34 submissions</b> ).		No (2a)	Support for the plan.
83	Support, but not convinced this is the right location ( <b>1 submission</b> ).		No (2b)	An alternative location for the zone was not suggested.
84	A greater emphasis on conservation ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	This will ensure fish stocks and enhance the opportunities for the surrounding areas.	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
85	Our organisation has no strong objection to this proposed sanctuary zone ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	However, like the Seal Island Sanctuary Zone, the Second Rock Sanctuary Zone should realistically have in place an anchoring management plan to effectively manage for the associated risks.	Yes (1e)	The plan now contains a strategy that specifies that restrictions on anchoring to protect vulnerable communities or locations, such as seagrass meadows, can be applied if deemed necessary in the future.
86	Make the zone larger ( <b>3 submissions</b> ).	The submissions provided one or more of the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To better preserve the marine environment (2 subs).</li> <li>• Should include Second Rock, the Sisters and Third Rocks (1 sub).</li> <li>• Should be at least double the size (1 sub).</li> <li>• To better conserve the area for future</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Second Rock Sanctuary Zone</b>				
		generation (1 sub). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seals don't live only in the restricted sanctuary zone shown. Fishing line and hooks etc are not compatible with seals. World wide experience has shown the bigger a sanctuary zone the more biodiversity and longer term viability it protects and provides for (1 sub).</li> </ul>		and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
<b>Submitters ticked “would support if changes were made” on the submission form</b>				
87	The sanctuary zone should be made larger ( <b>9 submissions</b> ). Some submissions also suggested the inclusion into this sanctuary zone of one or more of the areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seal Island (1 sub).</li> <li>Penguin Island (3 subs).</li> <li>First Rock (3 subs).</li> <li>Third Rocks (4 subs).</li> <li>Passage Rock (2 subs).</li> <li>The Sisters (1 subs).</li> </ul>	The submissions provided one or more of the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cave sanctuaries through these areas are unique and should be protected (2 sub).</li> <li>More emphasis needs to be placed on wildlife and biodiversity conservation and the ecosystems for future generations (3 subs).</li> <li>Will do little to protect the natural environment and the marine life in the area as it is too small (2 sub).</li> <li>Recreational activities from the increasing population will destroy the marine communities and penguin feeding grounds (1 sub).</li> <li>The rocks support marine life that needs to be sustained for the health of the marine park (1 sub).</li> <li>All communities and habitats should be represented and replicated (1 sub).</li> <li>To enable the ecosystem to return along with the complexities and the interdependencies inherent in it (1 sub).</li> <li>Historic shipwreck Belle of Bunbury lying between Penguin Island and First Rock</li> <li>Impressive sponges and sea fans grow on</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Second Rock Sanctuary Zone</b>				
88	The boundaries of the zone should be rationalised for ease of identification, management and enforcement issues (1 submission).	southern fringing reef of Penguin Island.	No (2d)	Zones will be clearly demarcated in the field once the zoning scheme has been gazetted.
89	Remove permissions for moorings (2 submissions).	Potential bottom impact.	No (2d)	DEC is developing a mooring plan that will manage the potential impact and siting of moorings within the marine park.
90	I would like the regulations that govern sanctuary zone use made stricter. No anchoring should be allowed (2 submissions).	Anchoring will disturb marine life too much as the area becomes more popular for boating and recreational activities.	Yes (1e)	The plan now contains a strategy that specifies that restrictions on anchoring to protect vulnerable communities or locations, such as seagrass meadows, can be applied if deemed necessary in the future.
91	No charter vessels, swimming etc., wildlife interaction and sailing boats (1 submission).	To ensure that there is no human contact and to ensure the true meaning of 'sanctuary'. Sanctuary that allows such human contact is an oxymoron.	No (2e)	Removing the listed activities would be inconsistent with the statutory purpose of marine parks; they are intended to provide for recreational and other uses consistent with the primary conservation objective and the Government's multiple-use policy. It would thus not represent a balanced outcome.
92	Commercial fishermen treated exactly the same as recreational fishermen. No commercial lobster fishing (1 submission).	Recreational fishermen are limited in the number of fish and rock lobsters they can take whereas commercial fishermen have carte blanche. Commercial are able to take what is in pots vs. recreational quotas.	No (2c)	The DoF manages fishing in all State waters, including in marine conservation reserves.
<b>Submitters ticked "do not support" on the submission form</b>				
93	Individuals did not support the zone but provided no additional comment (2 submissions).		No (2b)	No change sought.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Second Rock Sanctuary Zone</b>				
94	Recreational shore-based fishing (1 submission).	Recreational fishing has no detrimental effect.	No (2d)	The primary purpose of the zone is to provide protection for marine biodiversity including representative seagrass, intertidal and subtidal reef habitats. Scientific evidence has shown that recreational fishing can have an effect on marine biodiversity.
95	Recreational rock lobster and rod/line fishing must be maintained in the sanctuary zone (1 submission).	The zone is a special area for all to enjoy.	No (2e)	The primary purpose of the zone is to provide protection for marine biodiversity including representative seagrass, intertidal and subtidal reef habitats. Allowing fishing within a sanctuary zone is inconsistent with the statutory purpose of the zone.
96	Pointless exercise, don't zone (1 submission).		No (2f)	The CALM Act specifies that a marine park must be zoned as either sanctuary, recreation, special purpose or general use zone.
97	I wish to lodge a protest against the establishment of sanctuary zones within the marine park (1 submission).	Although I think it is an excellent idea to preserve the environment for generations to come I believe the creation of zones will do nothing to preserve the environment and fish stocks and it is my belief that this zone is being established solely for the benefit of the tourist trade.	No (2e)	The conservation measures proposed in the plan, particularly the sanctuary zones, are not designed to preferentially benefit the tourism industry to the detriment of other social uses, or solely to protect particular fish stocks. Sanctuary zones aim to help conserve all biodiversity, not just fish.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Becher Point Sanctuary Zone</b>				
<b>Submitters ticked "support" on the submission form</b>				

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Becher Point Sanctuary Zone</b>				
98	Individuals support the zone but provided no additional comment ( <b>29 submissions</b> ).		No (2a)	Support for the plan
99	Make the sanctuary zone larger ( <b>4 submissions</b> ). Some submissions also suggested the inclusion into this sanctuary zone of one or more of the areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should include Second Rock, the Sisters and Third Rocks (1 sub).</li> </ul>	The submissions provided one or more of the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To better preserve the marine environment (1 sub).</li> <li>This is a fish nursery area (1 sub).</li> <li>Should be at least double the size (1 sub).</li> <li>To better conserve the area for future generation (1 sub).</li> <li>Seals don't live only in the restricted sanctuary zone shown. Fishing line and hooks etc are not compatible with seals. World wide experience has shown the bigger a sanctuary zone the more biodiversity and longer term viability it protects and provides for (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
100	A greater emphasis on conservation ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	This will ensure fish stocks and enhance the opportunities for the surrounding areas.	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
101	Our organisation has no strong objection to this proposed sanctuary zone ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	However, like the other sanctuary zones the Becher Point Sanctuary Zone should realistically have in place an anchoring management plan to effectively manage the associated risks.	Yes (1e)	The plan now contains a strategy that specifies that restrictions on anchoring to protect vulnerable communities or locations, such as seagrass meadows, can be applied if deemed

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Becher Point Sanctuary Zone				
				necessary in the future.
<b>Submitters ticked “would support if changes were made” on the submission form</b>				
102	The sanctuary zone should be made larger ( <b>7 submissions</b> ). Submissions also suggested the inclusion into this sanctuary zone of one or more of the areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Murray Reef (3 subs).</li> <li>• The Sisters (2 sub).</li> </ul>	The submissions stated one or more of these reasons for their suggested changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will do little to protect the natural environment and the marine life in the area as it is too small (3 subs).</li> <li>• Future residential development will considerably increase pressures on this area and have a detrimental result on marine communities (2 subs).</li> <li>• All communities and habitats should be represented and replicated (1 sub).</li> <li>• As per CALM’s book, More Dive and Snorkel Sites of WA (p 8) (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
103	No moorings ( <b>1 submission</b> ).		No (2e)	A mooring plan will be developed for the marine park, with appropriate consultation, which will identify areas in which moorings are acceptable and/or necessary from environmental, equity and safety perspectives, and include an assessment of the capacity of each area.
104	The boundaries of the zone should be rationalised for ease of identification, management and enforcement issues ( <b>1 submission</b> ).		No (2d)	Zones will be clearly demarcated in the field once the zoning scheme has been gazetted.
105	I would like the regulations that govern sanctuary zone use made stricter. No anchoring ( <b>3 submissions</b> ).	Anchoring will disturb marine life too much, as the area becomes more popular for boating and recreational activities.	Yes (1e)	The plan now contains a strategy that specifies that restrictions on anchoring to protect vulnerable communities or locations, such as seagrass meadows, can be applied if deemed

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Becher Point Sanctuary Zone</b>				
106	Commercial fishermen treated exactly the same as recreational fishermen (1 submission).	Recreational fishermen are limited in the number of fish and rock lobsters they can take whereas commercial fishermen have carte blanche.	No (2c)	necessary in the future. The DoF manages fishing in all State waters, including in marine conservation reserves.
107	No charter motorised vessels, motorised vessels, swimming, diving, snorkelling, wildlife interaction and/or sailing boats (3 submissions).	Future residential development will put increased pressure on this area.	No (2e)	Removing the listed activities would be inconsistent with the statutory purpose of marine parks; they are intended to provide for recreational and other uses consistent with the primary conservation objective and the Government's multiple-use policy. It would thus not represent a balanced outcome.
108	Recreational fishing to be allowed in this area (3 submissions).	Recreational fishing is an important social and family pastime. Becher Point is a safe area to take young family members to fish and there is not enough evidence to support the banning of fishing from this area.	No (2e)	The primary purpose of the zone is to provide protection for marine biodiversity including representative seagrass, sand and intertidal reef habitats. Allowing fishing within a sanctuary zone is inconsistent with the statutory purpose of the zone.
<b>Submitters ticked "do not support" on the submission form</b>				
109	Individuals did not support the zone but provided no additional comment (4 submissions).		No (2b)	Did not support the plan but did not suggest any actions.
110	Recreational shore-based fishing (1 submission).	Recreational fishing has no detrimental effect.	No (2e)	Recreational shore based fishing can not be undertaken in this zone as it is not adjacent to a coast, however recreational boat-based fishing is not permitted. Scientific evidence has shown that recreational fishing can have an effect on marine biodiversity.
111	Pointless exercise, don't zone (1		No (2f)	The CALM Act specifies that a marine park



No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Becher Point Sanctuary Zone				
112	I wish to lodge a protest against the establishment of sanctuary zones within the marine park ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Although I think it is an excellent idea to preserve the environment for generations to come I believe the creation of zones will do nothing to preserve the environment and fish stocks and it is my belief that this zone is being established solely for the benefit of the tourist trade.	No (2e)	must be zoned as either sanctuary, recreation, special purpose or general use zone.  The conservation measures proposed in the plan, particularly the sanctuary zones, are not designed to preferentially benefit the tourism industry to the detriment of other social uses, or solely to protect particular fish stocks. Sanctuary zones aim to help conserve all biodiversity, not just fish.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)				
<b>Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form</b>				
113	Individuals support the zone but provided no additional comment ( <b>21 submissions</b> ).		No (2a)	Support for the plan.
114	This zone is supported ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	On that basis that all commercial fishing activity that currently occurs within this zone is proposed to be permitted.	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
115	Make larger ( <b>2 submissions</b> ). Submissions also suggested the inclusion into this zone of one or more of the areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend the zone up the western side of Cape Peron to north of John Point (1 sub).</li> </ul>	To better preserve the marine environment.	No (2e)	The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives.
116	Limited or no boat fishing within 800 metres of the natural shore line ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	To allow for a better breeding environment as well as a safer area for swimmers and recreational boaters including wind surfers.	No (2e)	The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)</b>				
117	Exclude commercial rock lobster fishing (1 submission).	Recreation and tourism is far more important than the small number of lobsters professionals will remove from this area. Deeper water is not accessible to recreational divers.	No (2f)	zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives.  The DoF manages fishing in all State waters, including in marine conservation reserves.
118	A greater emphasis on conservation (1 submission).	This will ensure fish stocks and enhance the opportunities for the surrounding areas.	No (2e)	The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1.
<b>Submitters ticked "would support if changes were made" on the submission form</b>				
119	Make the zone larger (7 submissions). Submissions either suggested expanding the size or suggested one or more of the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend further west (2 subs).</li> <li>Extend around Cape Peron and John Point (6 subs).</li> <li>Include snorkel trail at Cape Peron as sanctuary zone (1 sub).</li> </ul>	The submissions stated one or more of these reasons for their suggested changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fishing (particularly spear fishing) is not compatible with area where people expect to see fish (e.g. the snorkel trail) (3 subs).</li> <li>Easy access and significant snorkelling/ diving areas around Cape Peron (1 sub).</li> <li>We don't believe this document goes far enough to protecting our ecologically endangered marine park in Shoalwater Bay and the Second Rocks area (2 subs).</li> <li>Danger to wildlife from boat strikes. The threat</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)				
120	Make the whole zone a sanctuary zone (5 submissions).	<p>of injury or fatality from impact is very real. (2 sub).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To ensure preservation of the environmental habitat and scientific and educational value of the area (1 sub).</li> <li>• However no consideration has been given to the local dolphin population, probably because they do not spend any time on land making it more difficult to recognise and allocate a particular section of the marine park as being a critical habitat for the species. After 18 years in the area we know that the entire general use zone of the marine park between Cape Peron and the Causeway is important dolphin habitat. In particular, the shallow seagrass beds of Crystals Beach and the limestone reefs of Cape Peron, Point John and north to the southern end of Garden Island are critical feeding and breeding grounds for resident groups of bottlenose dolphins. To ensure the long term survival of the dolphins within the marine park, critical habitats such as these need to be recognised and their use restricted to activities that are in harmony with conservation objectives (1 sub).</li> </ul> <p>The submissions stated one or more of these reasons for their suggested change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife can not be conserved if mining exploration is permitted (1 sub).</li> <li>• As proposed this zone is unlikely to conserve any wildlife (1 sub).1</li> <li>• Active recreation destroys the habitat (1 sub).</li> <li>• The area contains important seagrass meadows (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)				
121	<p>Remove commercial and/or recreational fishing (<b>7 submissions</b>).</p> <p>Submissions suggested specifically removing one or more of the following types of commercial or recreational fishing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial fishing (6 subs).</li> <li>• Fishing charters (3 subs).</li> <li>• Collecting (2 subs).</li> <li>• Recreational fishing (3 subs).</li> <li>• Recreational bottom fishing (1 sub).</li> <li>• Recreational trolling (1 sub).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to population increases it is anticipated that thousands of people will use this small area in the future (1 sub).</li> <li>• All communities and habitats should be represented and replicated (1 sub).</li> <li>• Sanctuary zones can include special purposes zones within them (1 sub).</li> </ul> <p>The submissions stated one or more of these reasons for their suggested change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental impacts of boats and removing species (1 sub).</li> <li>• Lines and hooks end up in the ocean and so in the animals supposedly being protected (1 sub).</li> <li>• The area should be a natural habitat and for passive use only (3 subs).</li> <li>• Commercial activities and wildlife conservation can not coexist (1 sub).</li> <li>• Increasing population numbers mean potentially greater risk of harm to marine environments e.g. seagrass meadows (1 sub).</li> <li>• The area should be for recreational use only (except netting and spearfishing) (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	<p>The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.</p>
122	<p>Removal of development activities (<b>3 submissions</b>).</p> <p>Submissions suggested specifically removing one or more of the following types of development activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mineral and petroleum exploration (3 subs).</li> <li>• Dredging (1 sub).</li> <li>• Blasting (1 sub).</li> </ul>	<p>The submissions stated one or more of these reasons for their suggested change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing population numbers mean potentially greater risk of harm to marine environments e.g. seagrass meadows (1 sub).</li> <li>• These activities and wildlife conservation can not coexist (1 sub).</li> </ul>	Yes (1e)	<p>Table 3 has been amended to clarify that blasting and dredging, which is an activity that would be undertaken as part of a major infrastructure and development project, and mineral and petroleum extraction is not permitted in special purpose zones. This is consistent with the long-term targets for geomorphology, as specified in Section 9.1.1.</p>

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)				
123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structures and development (1 sub).</li> </ul> Removal or restriction of the following activities ( <b>2 submissions</b> ): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moorings (1 sub).</li> <li>• Motorised vessels (1 sub).</li> <li>• Anchoring (1 sub).</li> </ul>		Yes (1e)	DEC is developing a mooring plan that will manage the potential impact and siting of moorings within the marine park. In addition, the plan now contains a strategy that specifies that restrictions on anchoring to protect vulnerable communities or locations, such as seagrass meadows, can be applied if deemed necessary in the future.
124	Commercial fishermen treated exactly the same as recreational fishermen ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Recreational fishermen are limited in the number of fish and rock lobsters they can take whereas commercial fishermen have carte blanche.	No (2c)	The DoF manages fishing in all State waters, including in marine conservation reserves.
125	The present ski area be retained for water skiing activities ( <b>6 submissions</b> ).	The submissions stated one or more of these reasons for their suggested change: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Shoalwater ski areas have been in existence since 1963 without any ill effect on the surrounding environment. There has been no evidence or research that has been produced to justify the banning of water skiing in the area (5 subs).</li> <li>• This is the only local sheltered water ski area that is suitable for the majority of the summer; other ski areas are affected by the summer winds and are unsuitable for water skiing. The majority of water skiing will be conducted during the four summer months, mostly on weekends and only during the morning. This is not a huge impact on the area as apposed to other users (5 subs).</li> <li>• I can see no benefit to removing the water ski area unless a complete ban on power boats is imposed in the zone (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government. They considered this in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the inconsistency regarding vessel speeds, the relatively low proportion of the community actively using the area for water skiing on a regular basis and the alternative water skiing opportunities available. They recommended that the water ski area be removed and an 8 knot speed limit apply from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ski areas in Rockingham have already been affected by mussel farming, leaving minimal sheltered areas available for skiing. This plan will also reduce the Warnbro Sound ski area. Other ski areas at nearby dams are also under threat due to falling water levels as a result of climate change (4 subs).</li> <li>• This ski area is located away from houses and access roads and is not a well populated beach during the summer period. Unlike Palm Beach and Warnbro Sound ski areas which are adjacent to popular beaches, the Shoalwater ski area is a safe place to ski as the number of people ignoring ski zones and swimming in these areas is less (5 subs).</li> <li>• Removing the Shoalwater ski area and reducing the Warnbro Sound ski area will results in water skiers using other areas more frequently and therefore increasing the impact on these alternate areas (4 subs).</li> <li>• Little penguins are not frequently found in the northern area of the bay, therefore the likelihood of a penguin being in the ski area at the same time as it is used for water skiing is greatly reduced (4 subs).</li> <li>• Current speed limits are ignored on a regular basis. There is absolutely no point in bringing in more regulations and restrictions if they are not going to be enforced. I strongly believe that if the current regulations and restrictions were obeyed and indeed enforced then there would be no need for any changes (1 sub).</li> <li>• Regarding noise, the water ski area is adjacent to a dog beach. There is usually more noise from</li> </ul>		

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)</b>				
126	Remove the water ski area ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	<p>barking dogs heard 200 metres offshore than from boat engines. Fast moving boats have not been banned from the marine park as long as they operate outside the 200m exclusion and sanctuary zones. The existing water ski area is more than 200m away from any sanctuary zones and 200m from the nearest island. The only additional impact by water skiing as opposed to other boating would be the addition of one or two people being towed behind that boat (5 subs).</p> <p>The whole of Shoalwater Bay should be restricted to an 8 knot speed limit to protect seals, sea lions, little penguins and dolphins as propeller strikes are the main cause of killing or maiming marine life in this area.</p>	No (2a)	The water ski area will be removed and an 8 knot speed limit will apply from 1 July 2008.
127	Ensure beach fishing will be continued ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Conserve the recreation and education values of the area.	No (2d)	Beach fishing is not restricted in this zone.
<b>Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form</b>				
128	Individuals did not support the zone but provided no additional comment ( <b>3 submissions</b> ).		No (2b)	No change sought.
129	Must include zoning for indigenous law ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Traditional burial grounds, dreaming trails and lore grounds (ceremony).	No (2d)	The plan recognises the importance of aboriginal heritage and contains numerous strategies regarding involvement, education and interpretation. Cultural sites are already protected under the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i> . DEC will work with Aboriginal people to protect sites and facilitate education and awareness, including through representation on the Management Advisory Committee (MAC).

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)</b>				
130	Should be a sanctuary zone ( <b>2 submissions</b> ). In addition to the above statement, submissions also made one or more of the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>at least ban windsurfing and motor boat use. Please ask the ferry boat to enclose propeller (1 sub).</li> </ul>	The important areas for wildlife concern should be afforded as full a protection as possible. The importance of Penguin Island and the surrounding areas are well recognised by visiting birdwatchers and feature high on the list of places to visit in WA. A loss in status of protection would reflect badly on DEC.	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
131	Recreational shore based fishing ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Recreational fishing has no detrimental effect.	No (2d)	Recreational shore based fishing is not restricted within this zone.
132	Our organisation is seeking clarification on why commercial aquarium and specimen shell collection will continue to be permitted in a zone that is proposed for the purpose of wildlife conservation ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	The risk associated with both these activities was deemed too high for recreational users and subsequently prohibited, but is proposed to be permitted for commercial operators. It doesn't appear as though this is effective management for the purpose of wildlife conservation.	No (2e)	A limited number of commercial fishing licences authorises the take of aquarium fish and specimen shell across large areas of State waters. Commercial activity within the marine park is believed to be low and controls are available to DoF. This fishery is currently under review and activity will be monitored and further restrictions considered if necessary.
133	No changes, continued use of the gazetted water ski area ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Our organisation does not support any closures of existing water ski areas. Such closures are detrimental to safe practices in other metropolitan water ski sites as the use increases.	No (2e)	In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government. They considered this in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the inconsistency regarding vessel speeds, the relatively low proportion of the community actively using the area for water skiing on a regular basis and the alternative water skiing opportunities available.



No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)				
134	Leave it as is – bugger the yuppies (1 submission).	The amount of fish taken out of that area isn't worth talking about. Unless you are a politician looking for the yuppie vote.	No (2e)	They recommended that the water ski area be removed and an 8 knot speed limit apply from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.  Due to historical and current usage as well as anticipated increases in visitor numbers, existing management arrangements are not considered adequate to provide for conservation and sustainable use objectives.
135	Pointless exercise, don't zone (1 submission).		No (2f)	The CALM Act specifies that a marine park must be zoned as either sanctuary, recreation, special purpose or general use zone.
136	That spearfishing be maintained in the zone (3 submissions).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishing by free diving, up to the recreational bag limits, is a legitimate form of recreational fishing and should be allowed in all situations where other means of recreational fishing is permitted (3 subs).</li> <li>• Commercial line fishing targeting reef fish will be permitted to operate in this zone, as will the commercial take of live rock, sand and coral which the plan states is of concern yet is not being restricted. Given these two activities are to continue why is spearfishing prohibited (2 subs).</li> <li>• There is significant social value of spearfishing as individuals who participate will often gain an appreciation and understanding of the marine environment that they may not have previously had. Given the right influences and education this sport can be a great benefit to both the individual and ultimately the wider community (1 sub).</li> <li>• Equity is an issue as large areas of shoreline in the metropolitan area are closed to shore based</li> </ul>	No (2d)	Spearfishing is restricted in this zone as it has the potential to impact on the conservation of larger marine wildlife. Designation of the special purpose wildlife conservation zone recognises, in particular, its regular use by little penguins, Australian sea lions and bottlenose dolphins. In the past, spears have been removed from large animals like Australian sea lions, and this type of impact is unacceptable, even if the frequency of such events is not high. Spearfishing remains however, an allowable activity in the general use zone, which covers approximately 84 per cent of the marine park. It is acknowledged that access to the rocky shoreline has been reduced.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)				
		<p>spearfishing, yet open to all forms of line fishing. The marine park has areas that have suitable depths and accessibility for new and young spearfishers. Spearfishing is an active, healthy and sustainable form of catching fish and these attributes make it ideally suited as a family pursuit (2 subs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan acknowledges that DoF manages recreational fishing and this agency should be responsible for fisheries management and one particular user group should not be targeted without scientific justification. Although fish stocks may be stable they are generally low and anecdotal evidence indicates they are far from what they were in past years. This is because of sustained overfishing by both recreational and commercial fishermen. Catch rates for species taken commercially and recreationally need to be decreased until the populations of these fish again begin to flourish. I am prepared to accept such cuts in concert with those imposed on other fishermen in the area, not the banning of spearfishing while at the same time allowing recreational line fishermen and the commercial exploitation of these fish to continue at the present rate (2 subs).</li> <li>• It should be noted that spearfishing is the most sustainable form of fishing as it has no impact on non-target species and no bycatch. Suitable conditions are much more infrequent for spearfishers than line fishers (e.g. depth and visibility) and there are significantly less spearfishers than line fishers using the marine park. Spearfishers also do not use bait, a massive</li> </ul>		

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)				
		<p>extractive industry in itself (2 subs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The justification for the removal of spearfishing is laughable. That an activity “has the potential to cause such disturbance to fish” (p22) could well be applied to any form of activity, from commercial fishing to education visits by groups of school children. It can not be quantified, it can not be tested, it is pure speculation and it has no place whatsoever in the plan. Fish populations are naturally wary of all human activity and not solely of spearfishers. The marine park is inhabited by wild animals, if the purpose of this management plan is to create a large touch pool then that should be clearly stated. The lack of any scientific or indeed logical rationale is very disappointing (2 subs).</li> <li>• Suitable strategies can be found within the plan if an equitable and logical approach is taken, ie those strategies listed in section 9.2.6. Do some real research on which to base further assertions and proposals. What is the catch and effort of spearfishers in this area? How does spearfishing catch and effort compare with those sectors facing no additional restrictions (1 sub)?</li> <li>• The major fish populations under threat in the marine park are not the result of spearfishing. Those species listed in the plan naturally exist in mobile populations, such as salmon, herring and tailor, and the plan acknowledges that line fishing is the principal means of recreational fishing. While local fishing pressure may seriously deplete fishing stocks it is also likely that the reduction in numbers of pelagic fish taken in the marine park is indicative of the general depletion of these fish</li> </ul>		

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)				
		<p>in the metropolitan area and catch restrictions need to be increased on both commercial and recreational fishermen on a larger scale. Attempting to protect these species by introducing severe local restrictions in relatively small area seems futile and seems to contradict the principles of conservation, which seek to maintain a natural environment. This begs the question as to why line fishing is permitted to continue in the zone while spearfishing is not. Spearfishers do not generally target the same species as line fishers as they are either too small, quick and flighty, or too rare to be regularly speared (1 sub).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecotourism can be potentially damaging to the marine environment if not properly managed e.g. tourists could damage coral and disruption to fish populations, and yet it is allowed to happen in all areas of the marine park. Spearfishermen will be undoubtedly resentful if they are excluded from these zones while large numbers of visiting divers are allowed free access, and in the process damage and disrupt the marine life. I am concerned about the potential damage ecotourism on some of our pristine diving areas is being overlooked and ignored, and the result on other social values such as spearfishing and conservation (1 sub).</li> <li>• Spearfishing in the past had some bad press and is sometimes blamed by the uninformed for the ongoing depletion of fish in certain areas such as the marine park. In every sport there are those who do not act in a sporting manner and in many sports there is the danger of injury to others. However laws govern the safe use of spearguns</li> </ul>		

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation)				
		<p>and bag limits. Spearfishing should not be banned because of community antagonism towards the sport. Education and training of those who use spearguns and adequate enforcement of the marine park is what is required to arrest the actions of those who do not operate within those laws (1 sub).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over the past two decades there has been a sharp increase in interest in conservation, the 'Green vote' and animal rights. Some individuals who have a more extreme form of conservation, such as those who believe that killing an animal such as a fish is a crime akin to murdering a person, are intolerant of recreational fishing to catch a feed of fish. It is the role of government and their departments to moderate these conflicting views to ensure that one social value does not suffer from a lack of consideration because of the intolerance of another group. In such cases someone is required to adjudicate on who is being 'reasonable' and who is not (1 sub).</li> </ul>		

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Murray Reef Special Purpose Zone (Scientific Reference)				
<b>Submitters ticked "support" on the submission form</b>				
137	Individuals support the zone but provided no additional comment ( <b>32 submissions</b> ).		No (2a)	Support for the plan.
138	Make larger ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	To better preserve the marine environment.	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Murray Reef Special Purpose Zone (Scientific Reference)				
139	Greater emphasis on conservation ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	This will ensure fish stocks and enhance the opportunities for the surrounding areas.	No (2e)	<p>biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.</p> <p>The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1.</p>
140	Commercial fishermen treated exactly the same as recreational fishermen. Support for the Penguin feeding areas ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Recreational fishermen are limited in the number of fish and rock lobsters they can take whereas commercial fishermen have carte blanche. Support for the penguin feeding areas.	No (2c)	The DoF manages fishing in all State waters, including in marine conservation reserves.
141	Exclude commercial rock lobster fishing, crabbing, abalone, shell collecting, aquarium collecting, line fishing and charter fishing ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Recreation and tourism is far more important than the small number of lobster professionals this will remove from this area. Deeper water is not accessible to recreational divers.	No (2e)	Most of the listed activities are not allowed within the zone. The take of rock lobster is allowed however research that is occurring across some of the State's other marine conservation reserves will help clarify the impact of this activity for future planning

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Murray Reef Special Purpose Zone (Scientific Reference)				
				processes.
<b>Submitters ticked “would support if changes were made” on the submission form</b>				
142	No commercial or recreational fishing (1 submission).	Shouldn't we be thinking about reducing these activities considering the state of the oceans. Also some lines and hooks end up in the oceans and so, in the animals we're supposedly trying to protect. Keep the area passive. It wouldn't hurt us humans to come to terms with this concept for a change. Environmental impact of boats and removing species.	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
143	Should be a sanctuary zone (6 submissions). The submissions also discussed one or more of the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area needs to be significantly expanded (2 subs).</li> <li>• Recreational rock lobster fishing should be prohibited in this zone (1 sub).</li> </ul>	The submissions stated one or more of the following reasons for their suggested change: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to consider increased usage by non qualified people (1 sub).</li> <li>• Difficult to patrol (1 sub).</li> <li>• The area still needs more research into Little Penguin feeding habitats (1 sub).</li> <li>• Marine life strays from the Becher Point Sanctuary Zone, the inclusion of this area could expand the protected area (1 sub).</li> <li>• All communities and habitats should be represented and replicated (1 sub).</li> <li>• Sanctuary zones can include special purpose areas within them (1 sub).</li> <li>• As it stands the scientific community can scientifically record the decline of the area (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Murray Reef Special Purpose Zone (Scientific Reference)				
<b>Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form</b>				
144	Individuals did not support the zone but provided no additional comment (2 submissions).		No (2b)	No change sought.
145	Recreational shore-based fishing (1 submission)	Recreational fishing has no detrimental effect.	No (2e)	Recreational shore-based fishing can not be undertaken in this zone as it is not adjacent to a coast. Scientific evidence has shown that recreational fishing can have an effect on marine biodiversity.
146	Pointless exercise, don't zone (1 submission).		No (2f)	The CALM Act specifies that a marine park must be zoned as either sanctuary, recreation, special purpose or general use zone.
147	Allow amateur fishing (1 submission).	Close to the boat ramps and protected for small boats.	No (2e)	The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives.
148	Commercial charter vessels are permitted to enter the zone and so are commercial rock lobster boats. Recreational rock lobster fishers are able to anchor in the zone with the potential to damage reef, weed beds and coral. These activities are detrimental to the objectives of the zone and should not be permitted (1 submission).	If these activities are permitted in this area the original purpose for setting up this zone cannot be met. Allowing activities that undermine the objectives of the zone, while at the same time banning spearfishing is unfair. This area has some of my favourite spearing locations in Rockingham waters. I accept that in the interests of conservation that this will no longer be possible. Accepting this is made more difficult knowing that the objectives of this zone cannot be met because of the activities that are still permitted. There are some beautiful caves in this area with delicate brightly coloured soft corals. Ecotourism charter boats entering this area with large numbers of divers will	No (2e)	The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The take of rock lobster is allowed, however research that is occurring across some of the State's other marine conservation reserves will help clarify the impact of this activity for future planning processes.



No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Murray Reef Special Purpose Zone (Scientific Reference)</b>				
149	Our organisation seriously questions the worth of the scientific reference zone given that it also allows commercial rock lobster fishing ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	<p>cause a lot of damage to coral formations and stress to fish populations over time.</p> <p>Scientific reference zones should be exclusively no go zones for any activity other than research for true unbiased results. Our organisation views this decision to allow rock lobster fishing in a scientific reference zone as fundamentally bias toward the professional western rock lobster fishing interests at the expense of both recreational fishing and broader environmental stakeholders. Given that commercial rock lobster fishers are able to target rock lobsters both entering and leaving the sanctuary zone it seems too conciliatory to allow them to pot in an area which is zoned for research. It appears the proposed zoning was designed to ensure that the planning process proceeded without significant industry opposition and to prevent the likelihood of compensation having to be paid to the Western Rock Lobster Industry. In doing so the outcomes are clearly undesirable to all other groups, especially recreational fishing, which has lost access to popular recreationally fished areas and gained nothing from its ongoing participation in the planning process. These same concessions to the rock lobster fishing industry were widespread through the Jurien Bay Marine Park and make our organisation seriously question the integrity of the whole marine park planning process.</p>	No (2e)	The take of rock lobster is allowed, however research that is occurring across some of the State's other marine conservation reserves will help clarify the impact of this activity for future planning processes.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
----	--------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------	-------------------

General Use Zone				
Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form				
150	Individuals support the zone but provided no additional comment ( <b>25 submissions</b> ).		No (2a)	Support for the plan.
151	Support ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	To allow for a safe environment, better breeding grounds and safer for other recreational users.	No (2b)	No change sought.
152	A greater emphasis on conservation ( <b>2 submissions</b> ). In addition to the above statement, submissions also made one or more of the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make it larger (1 sub)</li> </ul>	To better preserve the marine environment, fish stocks and to enhance the opportunities for the surrounding areas.	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
153	Under supervision ( <b>1 submission</b> ).		No (2a)	Support for the plan.
154	Removal or restriction of the following activities ( <b>2 submissions</b> ): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• commercial fishing (1 sub).</li> <li>• limit recreational fishing (1 sub).</li> <li>• no spearing of fish or other marine life (1 sub).</li> <li>• commercial rock lobster fishing (1 sub).</li> <li>• crabbing (1 sub).</li> <li>• abalone fishing (1 sub).</li> <li>• shell collecting (1 sub).</li> <li>• aquarium collecting (1 sub).</li> <li>• line fishing (1 sub).</li> <li>• charter fishing (1 sub).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So my grandchildren can experience some of the wonderful marine life that I have observed in my younger days once again (1 sub).</li> <li>• Recreation and tourism is far more important than the small number of lobsters, professionals will remove from this area. Deeper water is not accessible to recreational divers (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	Removing the listed activities would be inconsistent with the statutory purpose of marine parks; they are intended to provide for recreational and other uses consistent with the primary conservation objective and the Government’s multiple-use policy. It would thus not represent a balanced outcome.
155	We note that all commercial fishing		No (2a)	Support for the plan.

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>General Use Zone</b>				
	activities that currently occur within the zone are proposed to be permitted. On that basis this zone is supported <b>(1 submission)</b> .			
<b>Submitters ticked “would support if changes were made” on the submission form</b>				
156	Reduce the amount of commercial fishing permissible and not have any recreational fishing <b>(1 submission)</b> .	84% of the marine park dedicated to commercial fishing is too much fishing for a zone that is supposedly being conserved. Leave the fish for the animals; it'd make a nice change.	No (2e)	The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
157	No dredging (other than what is necessary to maintain boat ramps and jetties) or blasting <b>(2 submissions)</b> .	Would you allow these activities in Kings Park?	No (2f)	Table 3 has been amended to clarify that blasting, which is an activity that would be undertaken as part of a major infrastructure and development project, is not permitted in special purpose zones. Any new development proposals that impact the marine park will be formally assessed by the EPA and DEC/MPRA, considering this plan and the requirements under the EP Act.
158	No mineral and petroleum exploration <b>(1 submission)</b> .		No (2f)	Table 3 has been updated to reflect DEC’s intention regarding mineral/petroleum exploration and development in the sanctuary and special purpose zones. However mining and mineral extraction is managed under other State legislation and changes to legislation are outside the scope of this plan.
159	Zone as special purpose (scientific reference)	No marina at Point Kennedy. Little penguins use the	No (2e)	Any new development proposals that impact the

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
General Use Zone				
160	<p>(1 submission).</p> <p>Should be reduced in area and include more sanctuary and conservation zones (2 submissions).</p>	<p>area around Becher Point Sanctuary Zone.</p> <p>The 'whole ocean' is a general use zone, so make this small area of Shoalwater a total sanctuary zone.</p>	No (2e)	<p>marine park, including developments at Port Kennedy, will be formally assessed by the EPA and DEC/MPRA, considering this plan and the requirements under the EP Act. In addition, the Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to bring the Port Kennedy exclusion area into the marine park within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1. The inclusion of the Port Kennedy exclusion area will follow an appropriate public participation process.</p> <p>The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.</p>
161	Afford at least the majority of the marine park 'sanctuary status' (2 submissions).	<p>The submissions stated one or more of the following reasons for their suggested change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The limitations of the zoning scheme listed on p23 should be addressed and all communities and habitats should be represented and replicated.</li> <li>• To be effective this area should be for passive activities only.</li> </ul>	No (2e)	<p>The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and</p>

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>General Use Zone</b>				
162	Make the area more accessible to commercial fishing ( <b>2 submissions</b> ).		No (2e)	species of the marine park. Commercial fishing is allowed in up to 94% of the marine park.
<b>Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form</b>				
163	Individuals did not support the zone but provided no additional comment ( <b>2 submissions</b> ).		No (2b)	No change sought.
164	Change to sanctuary zone and include Cape Peron ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Tens of thousands live in the Rockingham Shire. General use will result in loss of marine habitats. Penguin kills will increase and seagrass meadows are at risk.	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
165	Zone as special purpose zone (scientific reference). No lobster fishing, allow other activities ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Rockingham shire will increase in population. This area is already under pressure. Need to plan for the future.	No (2e)	The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
166	I am concerned that fishing will be allowed in 84% of the marine park. If it was up to me	I attach an article from Lance Ferris, published in Australian Geographic, April to June 2004 edition,	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and

No	Changes would like to see made	Reason for these changes	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>General Use Zone</b>				
167	I would declare a ban on all recreational fishing in the marine park but I realise that my views are extreme. 84% is much too generous, I would suggest 42% (1 submission).  Recreational shore based fishing (1 submission).	which describes the harmful effects of recreational fishing on our wildlife. My daughter and I have personally witnessed the distress caused to birds by fishing tackle, we once (unsuccessfully) rescued a cormorant totally wrapped up in fishing line with 5 hooks embedded in its body, multiple sinkers attached and all that was left of the bird was skin and bones, it died a very shocking death at the vets. I have also witnessed pelicans with hooks and sinkers hanging from their feet, obviously in pain. When snorkelling, we are also appalled at the amount of fishing line littering the rocks, a real eye sore and above water, the number of plastic bags and various litter left behind by fishermen.  Recreational fishing has no detrimental effect.	No (2d)	biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park. With the finalisation of the management plan, funding will be available for education and interpretation, which will include information about best practice and issues such as litter.  Recreational shore based fishing is not restricted within this zone.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Proposed Cape Peron Sanctuary Zone</b>			
<b>Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form</b>			
168	Individuals support the proposed zone but provided no additional comment (14 submissions).	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
169	Submission supported extending the Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone to include the Cape Peron area (3 submissions): In addition to providing the above statement, submissions made one or more of the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maybe the fish will come back (1 sub).</li> <li>Protect more of the shallow reef from spearfishing (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan’s implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1. In examining the Cape Peron area,

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Proposed Cape Peron Sanctuary Zone			
170	<p>Submissions supported a sanctuary zone at Cape Peron and suggested one or more of the following areas for consideration as a sanctuary zone <b>(26 submissions)</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the snorkel trail (southern point of Cape) to John Point (8 subs).</li> <li>• Include areas east of John Point (4 subs).</li> <li>• The whole area, no specific sites given (2 subs).</li> <li>• Include Mushroom Rock (2 subs).</li> <li>• Include White Rock (3 sub).</li> <li>• Include Bird Island (3 sub).</li> <li>• Beaches on the south side of the Cape (2 subs).</li> <li>• Extend zone 200m out from the shore (1 sub).</li> <li>• From the snorkel trail to the steps near the northwest point of the car park (1 sub).</li> <li>• Around the snorkel trail, but of sufficient size (2 subs).</li> <li>• At the very top of the Cape Peron area in the area not conflicting with abalone fishing (2 subs).</li> <li>• Include the outer reefs and extend south through the islands to Penguin Island (1 sub).</li> </ul> <p>Submissions suggested one or more of the following reasons for a sanctuary zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's ideal as the shallow sheltered waters have spectacular coral structures and are well suited to beginners and those learning more about the marine park environment, eco-tourism, the scientific uses and great ecological value. It would be a fantastic natural classroom (4 subs).</li> <li>• The diverse bird and animal life of the area is amazing and the area has seagrass and sea life living there and fish stocks for them (3 subs).</li> <li>• Cape Peron should be left as natural as possible, not gentrified as some people would have done (1 sub).</li> <li>• The provision of snorkel trails is a great start, but this does not go far enough. This is a historically heavily used area and there is a need to assist this area to recover its fish stocks; although the extent to which the amount and nature of biomass previously in balance can be restored is doubtful (2 subs).</li> <li>• There are large beach areas for shore fishing to the south and north of this region, so fishermen would miss out on a traditional area that they have fished, but the value of this area as a place of education and eco tourism would far outweigh the inconvenience</li> </ul>	Yes (1d)	<p>alternate zones could be proposed.</p> <p>The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Proposed Cape Peron Sanctuary Zone			
	<p>to the fisher people (1 sub).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A zone like this would stop the current use of this area by jet skis where there have been numerous near misses of jet skis almost running over people snorkelling. There is plenty of area off shore for these craft. The area is too valuable to allow these sorts of craft near the reefs (1 sub).</li> <li>• Cape Peron is a unique natural beauty close to Perth and all action should be taken to preserve this jewel and not allowed it to be turned into dredged canals. Only recreational beach fishing allowed (1 sub).</li> <li>• The most popular and accessible to the public, yet the least protected area, bring it in line with the majority of the marine park (1 sub).</li> <li>• The area is of high scenic value. The loss of seagrass meadows due to epiphytic growth on various species associated with high nutrients is not likely to change in the near future it is nevertheless possible to provide some scope for other members of this ecology to recover. Simple measures, for instance, such as attempting to reduce human impact on the intertidal zones might be one small way of trying to restore some balance (1 sub).</li> <li>• The area must be sufficiently large to enable an ecosystem return along with the complexities of the interdependencies inherent in it. Simply, zoning off the waters adjacent to the bay head beach will not achieve this outcome. It must be connected to the other sanctuary zones (1 sub).</li> <li>• Common seadragons are rare in this state and there is a colony at Cape Peron (1 sub).</li> <li>• This special reef habitat deserves to have the ultimate protection, passive recreation and be a no-take area (1 sub).</li> </ul>		
171	Indigenous sacred sites must be protected. Burial sites at cove in addition to dreaming and song lines <b>(2 submissions)</b> .	No (2d)	The plan recognises the importance of aboriginal heritage and contains numerous strategies regarding involvement, education and interpretation. Cultural sites are already protected under the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i> and further protection was not deemed necessary.
172	I will have to visit the area as all I know about Cape Peron is that it is used by school children <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2b)	No change sought.
173	More rubbish collection <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2d)	Rubbish bins are provided by the local council at boat



No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Proposed Cape Peron Sanctuary Zone			
174	No spearing 500m from shore <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2e)	ramps and in other areas adjacent to the marine park. In addition, through education programs DEC would like to encourage and educate users to take their rubbish away with them.  The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1. This proposal could include investigating the removal of spearfishing.
175	Cape Peron to be zoned as special purpose zone (scientific reference). Allow scuba trail (snorkel) <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2e)	The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1. In examining the Cape Peron area, alternate zones could be proposed.
176	There appears to be predominantly seagrass/sandy bottom habitat represented under the sanctuary zoning at present. More complex substrate and habitat does exist in this area and it is important to offer these areas protection as they support a great diversity of species. Reef habitat comes to mind as something that has not been included in the sanctuary zones to any great extent and would benefit from protection from commercial (and recreational) fishing interests <b>(1 submission)</b> .	Yes (1d)	The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1.
177	We would support the creation of a sanctuary zone around the Cape Peron area, giving access to a diverse marine habitat for the general public, for recreational and educational purposes. Recreational fishing where it does not negatively impact on marine life should be allowed <b>(1 submission)</b> .	Yes (1d)	The Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
Proposed Cape Peron Sanctuary Zone			
178	<p>Our organisation believes that the proposed zoning requires assessment to determine if the strategic objectives determined for the marine park, as specified on p15, have been adequately met prior to calling for public opinion on whether more sanctuary zones are required. If the objectives have not been met this should have been clearly stated to the public so further areas can be considered in light of those objectives. Our organisation suspects that the lack of clarity on this in the ‘Have Your Say’ brochure is likely to attract comments from those keen to see extractive activities removed from certain areas without any knowledge of those activities or without providing any real basis for doing so. On the basis that there may be a need for further representative habitats within the marine park, the fishing industry compared the benthic habitat proposed for protection under the plan against the habitat and the areas they currently operate in the Cape Peron area. As a result, Rock Lobster, Roe Abalone and Marine Aquarium operators, all of whom operate around Cape Peron, reached a position that they could collectively support an additional sanctuary zone being established on the north side of Cape Peron, surrounding John Point. While all three fisheries concerned do operate in the area proposed, it is acknowledged that there are a number of other areas of greater importance surrounding Cape Peron and protection of these may result in industry seeking compensation via the <i>Fishing and Related Industries Compensation (Marine Reserves) Act 1997</i>. Commercial operators who dive the area have advised that the suggested potential area for protection contains a range of benthic habitats including reef outcrops, rocks, sand and weed. It is a “hold up” area for species including tailor and herring. Its northern aspect, not represented in other proposed sanctuary zones, protects it from southwest winds making it a regularly used area for dive charters. The suggested area excludes the shoreline, taking into account recreational shore based fishing that may occur here. Recognising Cape Peron is important to certain commercial fisheries and these activities effectively co-exist with a range of recreational activities we would not be supportive of a recreation zone or a special purpose zone allowing only recreational interests being established in this area. Our organisation is not supportive of using the marine reserve planning process as a principle means of addressing resource sharing debates between sectors. With respect to progressing the development of additional sanctuary zones in the marine ark there is an expectation by industry that the proper consultative processes will be used. That is, a comprehensive assessment of the area’s biological and economic resources and social values will be undertaken and assisted by an advisory committee (suggesting the existing Focus Group could carry out this role), prior to being released for</p>	Yes (1d)	<p>In recognition of the concerns of users regarding inadequate consultation, the Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan’s implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Proposed Cape Peron Sanctuary Zone</b>			
179	<p>public comment (<b>1 submission</b>).</p> <p>Our organisation is supportive of the possible future establishment of a sanctuary zone in the general Cape Peron area to manage the conflict between existing extractive fishing activities and the growth and maintenance of tourism and recreational opportunities available in the marine park. The dimensions of a sanctuary zone and the provision of appropriate boating access should be referred to our organisation for comment when the matter is considered further (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	Yes (1d)	In recognition of the concerns of users regarding inadequate consultation, the Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate a separate planning process to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1.
180	<p>The summarised public comment brochure states that separation of conflicting uses in Cape Peron may be desirable and the creation of a sanctuary zone is one possible mechanism to achieve this. As recreational fishing would not be allowed it needs to be mindful of the existing boat launching facility and the proposed marina and associated developments around Cape Peron. As such, any proposed sanctuary zone in this location should not conflict with the boat users of the surrounding coastal waters (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	Yes (1d)	In recognition of the concerns of users regarding inadequate consultation, the Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate a separate planning process to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1.
<b>Submitters ticked "do not support" on the submission form</b>			
181	<p>Individuals did not support the proposed zone but provided no additional comment (<b>9 submissions</b>).</p>	No (2b)	No change sought.
182	<p>Did not support the proposed zone (<b>5 submissions</b>).</p> <p>Submissions indicated one or more of the following reasons for not supporting the zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please manage areas do not lock areas away (1 sub).</li> <li>• It is fine the way it is (1 sub).</li> <li>• The area is already quite well protected from boating by nature (1 sub).</li> <li>• Not necessary yet provided the other zones are controlled as proposed (1 sub).</li> <li>• Any further proposals restricting spearfishing in this region should be dropped (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
183	<p>The proposal for a sanctuary zone at Cape Peron was not part of the original discussion process and only the 'Have Your Say' brochure makes any mention of this proposal. The</p>	Yes (1d)	In recognition of the concerns of users regarding inadequate consultation, the Minister for the Environment

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>Proposed Cape Peron Sanctuary Zone</b>			
	plan does not mention this proposal, making it impossible to provide comment when no information is disclosed about where the sanctuary zone will exactly be located or its proposed size. Our organisation rejects the proposal for an additional sanctuary zone at Cape Peron on the principle that there is insufficient information to justify the increased protection. Without an objective assessment during the development phase the task of commenting on the concept of a sanctuary zone at Cape Peron is extremely difficult. The fact that it is not accompanied with any risk assessment, reasoning or indication of its size makes our organisation question the integrity of such a proposal. This is unacceptable and reflects poorly on the DEC's consultation process ( <b>1 submission</b> ).		has requested that DEC instigate a separate planning process to investigate the possibility of a sanctuary zone in the Cape Peron area within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>7.1.3 Limitations of the zoning scheme</b>			
184	Given the number of limitations with the zoning scheme the plan lists, the merit in actually proceeding with the implementation of this plan can be seriously questioned. Although DEC is optimistic that the zoning scheme will achieve the numerous conservation objectives outlined, our organisation is sceptical that the associated zoning will deliver any measurable benefits to marine conservation. While the sanctuary zones may become effective marine observation areas for ecotourism operators, the real benefits to fish populations in the wider area will be negligible ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2e)	The plan acknowledges that the zoning scheme has some limitations from reserve design and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park. The plan also contains a high priority strategy to commence the planning process to further consider a sanctuary zone off Cape Peron within the first year following gazettal of the plan.
<b>7.2 Education and interpretation</b>			
185	It would be good to get a sign erected in the Pengoes car park area that provides some basic safety information for kite surfers and tourists. The WA Kite Surfing Association can help	No (2d)	The development and implementation of an education and interpretation program is a key strategy in the plan,

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
186	you with that <b>(1 submission)</b> . More education is needed regarding conservation/environment policies and about taking from our fragile and precious ecosystems <b>(3 submissions)</b> .	No (2d)	and signage and education materials will be prepared to ensure users are aware of relevant information for the marine park. With the gazettal of the management plan additional resources will be available to achieve the strategies outlined in the plan, including education.
187	It is suggested that user groups are contacted and information sent out, such as to fishing, kayaking or wind surfing clubs. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	With the gazettal of the management plan additional resources will be available to achieve the strategies outlined in the plan, including education and information will be made available to users of the marine park.
188	The plan includes a strategy to implement appropriate signage indicating zone boundaries and inform users about the types of zones, reasons for and restrictions on activities in the marine park. However it may be of benefit to indicate the proposed signs and/or marker points to be used in the final plan to reduce the risk of users not knowing what the markers mean or missing the information during the public consultation process <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2d)	The style of in-water signage does change with changing Government policy and better understanding for the safe and effective implementation of signs. Information about in-water signage, including photos, will be included on the information brochures prepared regarding the marine park and its zoning scheme.
189	Our organisation welcomes opportunities for future partnerships with the DEC in respect to the preparation and presentation of educational material to enhance local awareness and appreciation of the marine park within schools and the general community. It is suggested that such material may include information in respect to diving and snorkelling opportunities within the marine park <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2d)	The Government provided additional funding for the metropolitan marine parks of \$105,000 for 2006/07, \$210,000 for 2007/08 with a further increase in 2008/09. A significant portion of these funds will be directed to the marine park, which enhances its current funding. As such, there is increased capacity to deliver appropriate education and interpretation programs.
<b>7.3 Public participation</b>			
190	Our organisation submits that relationships between DEC and the people of Western Australia can be greatly improved and enhanced by providing opportunities where volunteers can participate in practical activities. Through a collaborative approach that will enable community volunteers to assist to develop, design and install interpretative signage; or through workshops and information sessions staged for and by the community, DEC will realise a significant increase in public acknowledgment of the management strategies to be	No (2d)	The plan contains a number of strategies that encourage community involvement in education, interpretation, monitoring and management programs. In addition a MAC will be established and a public participation strategy developed for the marine park.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
191	<p>implemented in the marine park. The community has a genuine interest and a desire to assist in practical way, and to volunteer their time, skills and abilities. Of significance is the fact that many overseas visitors, particularly young backpackers, constantly seek opportunities where they can enjoy interesting and diverse holiday experiences through volunteering. If their volunteering opportunities comprise elements of experiential learning, then their holidays experience is enhanced (<b>1 submission</b>).</p> <p>Ensure sporting organisations are included in participation and consultation processes, as these form a frequent marine park user group (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2a)	The plan contains a number of strategies that encourage community involvement in education, interpretation, monitoring and management programs. In addition a MAC will be established. All user groups will be encouraged to become involved in the marine park's management.
192	Our organisation seeks representation on the MAC to be established following the approval of the final plan ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2d)	Membership of the MAC will be invited and advertised via the local papers. All expressions of interests will be considered.
<b>7.4 Patrol and enforcement</b>			
193	<p>More enforcement, including increased funding (<b>9 submissions</b>).</p> <p>In addition to the above statement, submissions also made one or more of the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A more obvious ranger presence is required. The marine park is heavily used, and intensive use requires an intensive management presence, particularly in the high season when Penguin Island and its associated waters become congested with visitors (3 subs).</li> <li>• The success of the plan will depend on sufficient funding to implement it. Sufficient staff with adequate resources (especially during school holidays) will be required for education, patrol and enforcement. If you are going to implement the plan without extra support and manpower then don't implement (2 subs).</li> <li>• I would like to see the rangers given full authority to enforce the rules. We have a number of problems regarding trespassing on 'no landing' areas. People, particularly in the summer holiday season, disregard the signs in the water near Seal Island and land on the island with some disastrous effects on the pelicans and upsetting the sea lions (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2d)	The Government provided additional funding for the metropolitan marine parks of \$105,000 for 2006/07, \$210,000 for 2007/08 with a further increase in 2008/09. A significant portion of these funds will be directed to the marine park, which enhances its current funding. As such, there is increased capacity to deliver appropriate patrol and enforcement.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
194	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage the bay properly and keep it in the pristine state that it is in at the moment (1 sub).</li> <li>• Frequent patrols are needed, including night patrols (1 sub).</li> <li>• The creation of more speed limits will only create more rules to be broken by those who don't care (1 sub).</li> <li>• If Cape Peron waters are more easily accessed, then the zoned areas will require heavy policing to work. The seals and penguins would be strongly threatened because of easy access by the increased boating activity from launching at Showalter Bay (1 sub).</li> </ul> <p>Where possible more thought might be given to making various government ranger groups cross skilled and armed to enforce legislation, whether it be for illegal motor-cross on a beach, marine pollution, dogs on beaches where they are not permitted, speeding skippers and so on. With a better enforcement capacity, the more possible it is to curb destructive actions on our marine and littoral environments (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2d)	DEC works closely with a number of State Government agencies, including DoF and DPI. For example, DEC and DoF have enhanced their working arrangements to ensure effective collaborative implementation of relevant management plan strategies. This includes the development of joint works plans, cross-authorisation and coordinated patrols.
<b>7.5 Management intervention and visitor infrastructure</b>			
195	Boundaries of zones need to be clearly marked ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2d)	Zones will be clearly demarcated in the field once the zoning scheme has been gazetted.
196	Note that there is a requirement for toilet facilities, particularly at Cape Peron where kayakers use the beach access for surfing activities ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2c)	The provision of shore-based facilities at Cape Peron is being addressed through the Rockingham Lakes Regional Park Management Plan.
197	Our organisation would welcome the opportunity to establish a partnership with DEC in respect to the provision of marine infrastructure providing access to the marine park in the future. It remains our organisation's position that the management and maintenance of Mersey Point Jetty should be the responsibility of DEC since the primary use is by officers of DEC and tour operators which service Penguin Island and the marine park in general. It is our organisation's position that the relevant agencies i.e. DPI and DEC should, as part of the plan's strategies, ensure that there continues to be safe boating access into the marine park from existing boat launching facilities. It is suggested that this should include providing and maintaining suitable navigational channels for boat users ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2d)	Provision of visitor facilities that enhances visitor enjoyment is a management objective of the plan and the management of access to and facilities in the marine park will be assessed through the life of the management plan.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
198	A number of navigation aids are located within the marine park boundary, including markers in Minstrel Channel and Warnbro Sound. The presence of navigation aids should be acknowledged (in Figure 3 on page 19 or otherwise). Issues regarding maintenance of nav aids and installation of any new nav aids need to be clarified in the plan ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Yes (1e)	The plan clarifies that the installation and maintenance of navigation aids and other boating safety measures is the responsibility of the DPI.
<b>7.6 Monitoring</b>			
199	Sufficient staff with adequate resources will be needed to monitor the potential influences of the main types of human activities on the marine park and to demonstrate that marine park objectives are being met. Whilst our organisation has confidence that its own activities will be well monitored and managed, it would like to see other key activities similarly monitored. This will ensure that the true cause(s) of adverse impacts are correctly identified and can then be effectively managed. Our organisation would therefore like to express strong support for DEC to be allocated sufficient resources to ensure the marine park is well monitored and managed ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2d)	With the gazettal of the management plan additional resources will be available to achieve the strategies outlined in the plan, which will include research and monitoring requirements.
200	We agree that rigorous monitoring is essential and would enable early detection of detrimental impacts. Once again it comes back to the point whether the government will place enough money aside to cover all aspects. The departments that are to protect & monitor the zoning scheme need to have the necessary qualifications. DEC is not qualified to undertake monitoring and who apart from an oceanographer is? We had relied on Cockburn Sound Management Council (CSMC) in the past and many in the community believe they have been severely let down. For example, the CSMC had a target of zero discharge into the Cockburn Sound in 2003 yet when new staff arrived and cancelled that goal and then conveniently claimed they weren't aware of it despite the fact that it was printed in their annual report ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2d)	The Government provided additional funding for the metropolitan marine parks of \$105,000 for 2006/07, \$210,000 for 2007/08 with a further increase in 2008/09. A significant portion of these funds will be directed to the marine park, which enhances its current funding. As such, there is increased capacity to deliver appropriate monitoring programs. A marine science program will be progressively implemented to coordinate and help deliver the research and monitoring strategies of the plan as part of a statewide initiative to improve the delivery of research and monitoring requirements within marine conservation reserves and inform adaptive management. Monitoring within the park will be coordinated by both DEC and the DoF. The Departments may need to bring in experts and tertiary institutions to assist them with technical monitoring tasks.
201	No mention is made of monitoring (daily and review) ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2d)	Section 7.5 is about monitoring and many of the specific ecological values also contain monitoring strategies. Section 10 concerns the audit and review of the plan's



No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
202	I believe it is important to provide local people with greater scope to become involved in the day to day monitoring of the marine park; provided that it is on a purely volunteer basis and not as an adjunct group with an ideological base <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2d)	outcomes.  Section 7.3 contains a strategy regarding community involvement in monitoring.
<b>8. Development proposals within the marine park</b>			
203	There is also a chance that the only stromatolites in the world could be destroyed as well as the penguin's feeding ground. Why can't they put a harbour in the shallow water, up near the grain terminal? It has only taken a few months to build a breakwater a few miles up the coast near Woodman Point; that doesn't interfere with anyone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Any new development proposals that impact the marine park will be formally assessed by the EPA and DEC/MPRA, considering this plan and the requirements under the EP Act.
204	No desalination plant at Becher Point. This is such a risk to the whitebait breeding area and the penguins will eventually be wiped out if this is allowed to be installed. We need to enable our unique penguins to be able to thrive in their natural habitat <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2d)	Any new development proposals that impact the marine park will be formally assessed by the EPA and DEC/MPRA, considering this plan and the requirements under the EP Act. In addition, the Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to bring the Port Kennedy exclusion area into the marine park within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1. The inclusion of the Port Kennedy exclusion area will follow an appropriate public participation process.
205	The population will increase dramatically from Perth to Mandurah - say to 200 000 in the near future. The plan should allow for this; tighten regulations so it will be more difficult to get approval as the population pressure increases. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Any new development proposals that impact the marine park will be formally assessed by the EPA and DEC/MPRA, considering this plan and the requirements under the EP Act.
206	There has been a lot of talk associated with the proposed development of a marina at Cape Peron. It seems to me that many public figures are attempting to push the development of a marina forward despite valid public concern. The public are not being consulted in a meaningful way on the Cape Peron project. The plan should be more closely aligned with Cape Peron and restrictions to development in Cape Peron should flow from the overall plan. If unchecked development is allowed at Cape Peron then the marine park will suffer	No (2c)	The proposal to extend the marine park boundary to include an additional area in Cape Peron would require a separate planning process and is beyond the scope of the plan.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
207	<p>considerably. In short the boundary of the marine park should be expanded to include the area of Cape Peron under consideration for development. I believe this will allow more careful consideration with an appropriate outcome (<b>1 submission</b>).</p> <p>There is little mention of existing infrastructure in the marine park (boat ramps, Sepia Depression outlet, the Saxon Ranger Dive Wreck, jetties, moorings, etc). A section is needed on existing infrastructure, including a discussion on how infrastructure expansions may be managed. This section focuses heavily on moorings, provides no discussion on other developments, recreational (marinas, jetties, dredging, groynes, boat ramps, diving platforms) or otherwise, and therefore appears to indicate that the only developments that will occur in the marine park will be for tourism or recreation infrastructure, despite recognising mineral and petroleum exploration and development as potential activities in the General Use Zone and Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation). This section should recognise that from time-to-time other infrastructure proposals will be considered, including ocean outlets (that will traverse the marine park although they don't discharge into the marine park), communication cables, fishing facilities, and the various types of recreational infrastructure mentioned above (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	Yes (1e)	<p>This section has been amended to mention the existing infrastructure. This section also mentions that proposals for additional or other the types of infrastructure, such as public works, could be received during the life of the plan. All proposals, whether for new developments or expansion of existing infrastructure will be formally assessed by the EPA and DEC/MPRA, considering this plan and the requirements under the EP Act.</p>
208	<p>The only moorings permitted in the marine park should be those currently outside the Safety Bay Yacht Club. Other moorings placed outside the Cape Peron campsites and the like should be removed (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2d)	<p>A mooring plan will be developed for the marine park, with appropriate consultation, which will identify areas in which moorings are acceptable and/or necessary from environmental, equity and safety perspectives, and include an assessment of the capacity of each area.</p>
<b>9. Management of ecological and social values</b>			
9.1 Ecological Values			
209	<p>The terms sewage and sewerage are used interchangeably. This should be corrected to reflect the proper meaning of each term (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	Yes (1e)	<p>The use of the term sewage and sewerage has been corrected to reflect their proper meanings.</p>
210	<p>The terms contaminants, pollutants and toxicants are used interchangeably. The use of these terms should be refined to reflect the issues. The presence of a contaminant (i.e. a substance present at levels above those normally found) does not automatically mean it is at levels sufficient to make it a pollutant (i.e. harmful to the environment) or toxicant (adversely affecting the survival, growth or fecundity of biota) (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	Yes (1e)	<p>The use of the terms contaminants, pollutants and toxicants has been corrected and standardised throughout the plan.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
211	<p>The plan should identify a broader range of potential issues and how they will be managed. For example, issues that may arise in the next 10 years include large scale oil spills, dredging, marinas, marine refuelling facilities, diving platforms, camping/accommodation facilities, commercial filming and photography, competitive water sport events (e.g. yachting), mass invasion of marine invasive species and a toxic algae outbreak. Some of these are ‘planned events’ that could be listed under Section 8 (Development Proposals within the Marine Park), as marinas already are. Others (oil spills, mass invasion of marine invasive species, toxic algae outbreak) are unplanned events that require the appropriate management (emergency response) plans to be in place. Oil spills and the relevant management measures are identified (DMP p. 36), but other unplanned events are not (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2d)	<p>Those ‘planned events’ listed require appropriate environmental assessment and approvals. Those ‘unplanned events’ listed are generally managed by other agencies and the development and/or implementation of emergency response plans is their responsibility. The lists contain in the management plan are not meant to be exhaustive, rather an example of the types of activities that may occur.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
212	<p>The plan's overarching statement (p.8) is that pressures on marine park values are due to primary or secondary impacts of user activities and the plan states that management priorities are to be determined by a risk assessment of the various pressures, based on their:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporal scale (long-term versus short-term);</li> <li>• Spatial scale (localised versus large scale);</li> <li>• The trophic level and conservation status of species protected;</li> <li>• The probability and frequency of pressure occurring; and</li> <li>• The consequences of the pressure (ecological and social implications).</li> </ul> <p>Sections 9.1 to 9.12 identify (i) existing and potential pressures and (ii) what are considered the current major pressure(s), on each ecological value of the marine park. There are numerous pressures identified, including our organisation's activities such as infrastructure development (seabed pipelines, groynes, marinas), discharge of TWW from the Sepia Depression outfall (sewage and industrial wastewater) and discharge of brine from Desal 2. Our organisation would like clarification on how the plan's stated risk assessment process was used to identify current and future major pressures. It is difficult to see how this conclusion was reached using the plan's stated basis for risk assessment. It would also be useful to know if the ranking is of the same 'degree' between different ecological values (eg does a major pressure on water and sediment quality have the same ecological implications as a major pressure on finfishes). The plan also confines itself to addressing current pressures likely to occur during life of plan (10 years) and that are considered manageable within a marine reserve context thus, the pressures due to climate change are not included. In a similar vein, it is not known to what extent commercial and recreational fishing pressure - or spatial patterns of fishing pressure in the park - have changed over the years. It may be possible that some of the effects being observed are a legacy of past practices, rather than the present level of use. As the plan notes that anecdotal evidence indicates the abundance of some finfish has declined, there is the potential for trophic cascade effects to occur, which often have symptoms akin to that of nutrient enrichment. No basis is provided for highlighting these (previously unmentioned) major pressures.</p> <p>Our organisation does not view TWW or brine discharge as major pressures on these ecological values of the existing marine park for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neither the existing TWW outlet nor the proposed Desal 2 outlet discharges into the marine park. The Sepia Depression outlet occurs 1.5 km west of the present marine park boundary, and the proposed Desal 2 outlet will be at least 2 km south of the present marine park boundary.</li> <li>• Oceanographic conditions are such that discharge from the existing Sepia Depression outlet very seldom reaches the waters of the marine park. In addition, our organisation's</li> </ul>	Yes (1e)	The listing of the Sepia Depression Ocean Outfall and the proposed second desalination plant has been removed as major pressures on the marine park's ecological values.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>considerable body of monitoring data to date has shown no adverse effects of TWW discharge on the ecology of the Sepia Depression and adjacent waters, or on recreational water quality in the marine park and its beaches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No advice has been received from DEC to the contrary despite over a decade of monitoring data being available. Brine disposal from the proposed Desal 2 outlet will essentially return seawater constituents back into coastal waters, and DEC conditions will further ensure any impacts on water quality and sediment quality are extremely localised (1 submission).</li> </ul>		
<b>9.1.1 Geomorphology</b>			
213	Not that 'relative' should read relatively (1 submission).	Yes (1e)	Text amended
<b>9.1.2 Water and sediment quality (KPI)</b>			
214	Water quality is the major concern. All the zoning will be of no use unless the polluters are curbed (1 submission).	No (2b)	No change sought.
215	<p>What is the ecological model underpinning the selection of the indicator? The Southern Metropolitan Waters Study provides adequate predictors of the nitrogen levels that are likely to produce phytoplankton blooms and increases in smothering periphyton on seagrasses. The impacts of TBTs are well understood but less is known about metals, pesticides and synthetic oestrogens (other than TBT). Water quality criteria have been developed for the Southern Metropolitan waters. Does the KPI integrate the potential effects of marine park's strategies on the identified pressures or threats to the strategic objectives? The vast majority of the potential contaminant sources for the marine park lie outside the managed area. The stormwater and groundwater catchments of Kwinana and Rockingham, the Sepia Depression waste water outfall and shipping probably provide the majority sources for pressures and threats. Whilst DEC (marine operations) has some regulatory powers with respect to these jurisdictions it cannot exercise overall management control. As such this KPI is questionable as a measure of performance in marine park management. Put another way, the failure to meet the KPI may well be the result of actions or inactions of external parties over which the marine park managers have little control (eg. DEC pollution control, City of Rockingham, Water Corporation). Water quality standards set to protect marine park values should not be determined by those set for marine waters in general. For example, the plan might specify that nitrogen inputs from the Sepia Outfall should not be</p>	No (2d)	<p>A marine science program will be progressively implemented to coordinate and help deliver the research and monitoring strategies of the plan as part of a statewide initiative to improve the delivery of research and monitoring requirements within marine conservation reserves and inform adaptive management. The marine science program will also progressively define and use appropriate performance measures, or surrogates, to monitor the values of the marine park to measure whether the objectives of the plan are being achieved. As a consequence, the detailed components to be measured cannot always be specified in detail in the plan but will be addressed through the marine science program. In determining baselines and trends for the ecological values of the marine park, DEC will consider both the natural variability that is inherent in the system, human impacts and other 'drivers' to change. The monitoring program for this reserve will consider this variability when</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>assimilated in the marine park where they may trigger unwanted ecological changes. Has a monitoring method and experimental design to service the KPI been identified in the plan? The plan refers to a snapshot water quality survey (in Warnbro Sound) conducted in 1994 as part of the Southern Metropolitan Coastal Waters Study. There has apparently been no sampling since and no time-series to speak of. It is implied that a similar sampling protocol would be resumed to satisfy ANZECC &amp; ARMCANZ 2000. Presumably it is intended to re-utilise the Warnbro Sound sampling station. It is also suggested that the Seal Island sanctuary zone would be a useful station for water/sediment quality monitoring in an area that could be influenced by inputs from the Sepia Depression waste water outfall. However this area is sometimes significantly enriched with N and P from concentrations of nesting cormorants and pelicans on Seal Island. As such it would be a poor monitoring station to detect nutrient inputs from the outfall. It is not a good choice of a sanctuary zone for marine biodiversity conservation as it is subject to atypically high levels of natural nutrient perturbation. Sepia Depression and other sources of nitrogen in the marine biota could be discriminated using 15N stable isotope ratios. The effect of contaminants on biota and ecosystems is far more relevant than instantaneous measures of concentrations. It would be preferable to have KPIs based on the measured exposure or assimilation of contaminants into marine biota, eg. metals in little penguin feathers, imposex in shellfish etc, 15N ratios in reef biota, periphyton on seagrass blades. Is there, or will there be, a program of surveillance monitoring (in or outside the marine park) measuring the level of background variation in the indicator? Currently there appears to be no time series for the proposed water quality/sediment parameters within the marine park. Sampling programs such as the Sepia Depression (control sites), Marmion Marine Park and Jurien Marine Park may provide a basis for predicting background variation. Integrated analysis of all these sampling programs would be beneficial. What is the probability that the data requirements for the indicator will be adequately resourced? The monitoring proposed to meet this KPI could be integrated with existing funded programs and be relatively low cost. However the utility of the KPI it services remains questionable (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>		<p>determining the significance of changes against the targets.</p>
216	<p>During the development of the plan, our organisation had expressed the importance of including discussions about the possible implications for the marine water quality from the discharge area and possible leakage from the Cape Peron waste water pipeline which traverses the marine park. Our organisation considers that the plan's description of potential pollution issues regarding the pipeline (page 34) and identification of this as a current major pressure (page 35) appears to address its previous concerns outlined above. However, our organisation notes that there is no map in the plan indicating the pipeline alignment and the</p>	No (2d)	<p>A reassessment of the Cape Peron waste water pipeline has been undertaken. The threat of the pipeline has been determined not to be a major pressure; however the impacts of the discharge will continue to be monitored.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
217	<p>discharge area. I suggest that depicting the pipeline alignment in the final management plan might be useful to assist future discussions about management of the marine park (<b>1 submission</b>).</p> <p>There is no apparent recognition of the our organisation’s proposed duplication of the Sepia Depression outlet (with the necessary environmental approvals) that is required to handle the projected increase in treated wastewater due to population increase, and potential brine disposal from Desal 1. The present Sepia Depression outfall traverses the proposed Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation) of the marine park. Structure and development are potentially permitted in this zone, but there is some inconsistency about this in the plan. Table 2 (p. 20) indicates it is potentially permitted, but the long-term targets in Section 9.1.1 (p. 32) are for no change to seabed structural complexity or coastal landform structures in special purpose zones (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	Yes (1e)	The discrepancy between the long-term geomorphology targets and Table 2 permitted uses have been clarified, i.e. changes in seabed structural complexity will be permitted within the special purpose zones.
218	<p>The 2nd paragraph on p34 indicates that water quality and sediment quality in the marine park will be affected by an increase in contaminants due to the our organisation’s proposed second water desalination plant, which is therefore listed as a major pressure on the water quality and sediment quality of the marine park. The seawater concentrate that is a by-product of the desalination plant is effectively composed of material extracted from seawater and published literature does not show any detrimental effects associated with such discharges. Nor will the proposed desalination plant discharge into the marine park. Our organisation disagrees with this statement listing the proposed second water desalination plant as a major pressure (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	Yes (1e)	The proposed desalination plant has been removed from the plan.
219	<p>The 4th paragraph on p 34 states that the Woodman Point Wastewater Treatment Plant discharges tertiary treated wastewater and industrial discharge from Kwinana into the Sepia Depression, and that occasional climatic events may drive these nutrient-enriched discharge plumes into the marine park. This paragraph needs further clarification/qualification. Nutrient enrichment of the marine park due to the present ocean outlet only occurs very occasionally, and is furthermore localised, short-term and occurs during winter (when nutrient enrichment is less of an in issue than in summer). Most of the time the present outfall does not affect water quality in the marine park at all, and it therefore represents a very low risk of adverse effects on water quality and sediment quality of the marine park (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	Yes (1e)	This paragraph has been clarified and states that at present the discharge from the ocean outfall is not a major pressure on the marine park’s water and sediment quality and is being monitored. The discharge from the ocean outlet has also been removed as a major pressure on water and sediment quality however it remains as a potential future pressure.
220	<p>The 2nd paragraph on p 35 states that the discharge of hyper-saline solution from the</p>	Yes (1e)	References to the proposed desalination plant have been

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>proposed second desalination plant has the potential to affect water quality in the vicinity of the discharge point. This paragraph should be replaced with: “Our organisation is seeking environmental approval for a second seawater desalination plant in the southern Perth coastal zone. The plant will necessitate the discharge of hyper-saline solution. This future discharge under the current proposal is estimated at between 1 and 3 km from the Park boundary. The effect of the future discharge will be limited to the area in the immediate vicinity of the outlet. It is unlikely that the future discharge will affect water quality in the Park, as both the EPA and the DEC will be placing water quality conditions on the plant, and the our organisation will undertake regular monitoring.” It also states that the proposed second water desalination plant is an existing and potential uses and/or pressures. The proposed desalination plant should be removed from this section as it will not discharge into the marine park, and is not seen as a pressure on water quality and sediment quality <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>		<p>removed from the plan as they are addressed through Section 8, Development proposal within the marine park.</p>
221	<p>Figure 4 - The caption should make it clear that this refers to sewage discharge from vessels <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	Yes (1e)	<p>The prohibition on vessel-based sewage discharge has been clarified.</p>
222	<p>Our organisation would like to note that the environmental data collected as part of its Perth Long-term Ocean Outlet Monitoring and Sepia Depression Ocean Outlet Landline programmes are of potential value to the DEC for generating water and sediment quality targets, and establishing baseline conditions. Our organisation is keen to be involved in this process, and will be happy to make its data available for this purpose. Pathogens (faecal coliforms in water) are identified as a performance measure for water quality, with potential sources identified as sewage (from TWW discharge and vessel discharge) and urban runoff. It is not clear what or where this is being measured for, nor is there any mention of National Health &amp; Medical Research Council (NH&amp;MRC) guidelines for recreational use or seafood safety, just that a “negative trend” in concentrations is required (Section 9.1.2, p. 36). Faecal coliforms are presently used as an indicator for seafood, but enterococci are the (NH&amp;MRC) recommended indicator for recreational water quality at ocean beaches. Therefore, depending on the reason for measurement, enterococci may be a better indicator. ‘High water quality’ is also identified as a requirement for a number of social values in Sections 9.2.1 to 9.2.11, but no measures of water quality are proposed <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	No (2d)	<p>In determining baselines and trends for the ecological values of the marine park, the marine science program will work in collaboration with DEC’s operations group responsible for day to day management of the marine park, the DoF, and through other agencies with appropriate knowledge and/or expertise. The measures of water quality proposed for the social values will be those discussed in Section 7.1.2.</p>
<p><b>9.1.4 Macroalgae (subtidal-reef) communities</b></p>			
223	<p>More cleaning of the beach to rid it of the washed up seaweed. Maintain a clean</p>	No (2e)	<p>Algae that is washed onto the shorelines plays an</p>



No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	environment and to encourage people to use the beach. <b>(1 submission)</b>		important role in stabilising the beaches as well as harbouring invertebrates which are prey for surf zone fishes and birds. Consequently removal is only permitted adjacent to public access points such as boat ramps.
<b>9.1.8 Cetaceans</b>			
224	It has been well documented that ultra low frequency sound or shock waves have a devastating effect on dolphin's sensitive sonar ability and through complete confusion have beached and died. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
<b>9.1.10 Little penguin (KPI)</b>			
225	<p>What is the ecological model underpinning the selection of the indicator? The little penguin population breeding in Shoalwater Bay (principally on Penguin Island) does not appear to have fluctuated significantly around 600 pairs since studies began in the early 1980s. However past methods of assessing population size lack sufficient precision for this to be used as an indicator for the condition of the marine environment. There are significant inter-annual variations in laying dates, numbers of pairs nesting and breeding success resulting (we think) primarily from the availability of prey within foraging range of the colony. The critical prey species (at least during the important chick rearing period) is whitebait <i>Hyperlophus vittatus</i>. Radio tracking studies have indicated that the main foraging area for whitebait is south of Becher Point, in Comet Bay, outside the boundaries of the marine park. The whitebait consumed by the penguins had otolith oxygen stable isotope signatures indicating previous occupation of the whitebait nursery area, on the northern side of Becher Point. This area is in an Agreement Act area excised from the current marine park. Both whitebait recruitment and penguin breeding performance seem to be linked in a complex fashion to regional oceanographic factors, particularly the strength of the Leeuwin Current. The use of penguin breeding performance as an indicator of local management would require the measurement and filtering-out of these significant regional background variations. Does the KPI integrate the potential effects of marine park management strategies on the identified pressures or threats to the strategic objectives? The critical marine habitats for the little penguins breeding on the Shoalwater Bay Islands are not located within the marine park and are not subject to the proposed management strategies. Little penguin breeding performance /survivorship / recruitment parameters or contaminant burdens would however be useful indicators of the condition of metropolitan coastal waters</p>	Yes (1d)	<p>Amendments have been made to the strategies and targets for little penguins to better assess impacts on the population, and with the gazettal of the management plan additional resources will be available to achieve the strategies outlined in the plan, which will include research and monitoring requirements. In determining baselines and trends for the ecological values of the marine park, DEC will consider both the natural variability that is inherent in the system, human impacts and other 'drivers' to change. The monitoring program for this reserve will consider this variability when determining the significance of changes against the targets. In addition, the Minister for the Environment has requested that DEC instigate the planning processes to bring the Port Kennedy exclusion area into the marine park within the first twelve months of the plan's implementation. A strategy to this effect is now contained in Section 7.1. The inclusion of the Port Kennedy exclusion area will follow an appropriate public participation process.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>south of Cape Peron. Unfortunately this is not the jurisdiction the MPRA is required to audit. Boat strike may well be a significant and growing source of man-made mortality for the penguin population. Much, but by no means all, of it will be occurring within the marine park area. Has a monitoring method and experimental design to service the KPI been identified in the plan? Previous monitoring of little penguin breeding performance has relied on the availability of Murdoch University research students and volunteers (nest box monitoring). There is a significant time series dating back to the mid 1980s but there are significant discontinuities and considerable variation in sampling intensity. A new project has been funded for the next 2 years (Belinda Cannell <i>pers. com</i>) that will see a significant sample of birds marked with microchip tags and the calibration of breeding performance between birds using nest box verses natural burrows. The use of little penguin breeding performance or demographic parameters in a KPI will depend on a long term plan and commitment to monitoring. The plan makes no commitment to resource such a programme. Changes in diet that may be influenced by disturbances to the whitebait nursery or to the prey aggregations in Comet Bay could be monitored using C &amp; N stable isotope ratios in egg-shell membranes from hatched eggs, chick mesophile down and adult moult feathers (Dunlop et al. in press). Again these threats occur beyond the marine park boundaries and cannot be mitigated by marine park management strategies. Decisions to extend the marine park would have to be the subject of another indicative management plan process. Is there, or will there be, a program of surveillance monitoring (within or outside the marine park) measuring the level of background variation in the indicator? See history of time series above. What is the probability that the data requirements for the indicator will be adequately resourced? Funding for long-term monitoring activities is generally frowned upon by granting agencies because resources are required for lengthy, often indefinite, periods. Monitoring is not research and is therefore generally ineligible for research funding and is of low scientific importance. As a consequence it is improbable that consistent monitoring programmes to service KPIs could be maintained using resources other than those provided by the responsible management agency. <b>(1 submission)</b></p>		
<b>9.1.11 Finfishes (KPI)</b>			
226	<p>There could be a lot more restrictions on fishing. Can we expect that the fish populations will recover to compare with Marmion Marine Park? <b>(1 submission)</b></p>	No (2b)	<p>Research and monitoring being undertaken in the State's marine conservation reserves will help clarify the extent to which fish populations recover where sanctuary zones have been implemented.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
227	<p>The management planning process for the marine park began with the declaration of the marine park boundary in 1990. Local community groups such as the Friends of the Shoalwater Islands Marine Park provided submissions on the initial draft management plan in January 1995, more than 11 years ago. Many respondents at the time objected to the plan because it did not provide any no-take areas or sanctuary zones. The presence of marine park compliance resources would have a much-needed benefit for the management of the associated nature reserve islands (the subject of a Conservation Commission management plan). Given that it is politically inconceivable that the sanctuary zone issue will be resolved in the current planning cycle we propose another approach. The commercial and recreational fishing industries frequently claim that marine biodiversity conservation measures can be met using fisheries management instruments (ie. without closing areas to fishing). Perhaps it is time to test this in the marine park. It is proposed that we add new biodiversity objectives to the finfish value: to ensure an increase in the density and size of predatory reef fish species (breaksea cod, harlequin fish and blue groper) within the marine park during the life of the management plan. The onus should be placed on DoF and recreational and commercial fishers to implement management strategies that might achieve these objectives. The outcomes should be independently monitored in pre-selected limestone reef habitats using fixed parallax video camera technologies. The targets should be a documented increase in the density and size of the selected predatory fish at the pre-selected reef habitat monitoring sites. Failure to meet these targets should see the introduction of CAR sanctuary zones over limestone reef and pavement habitats in the next plan. <b>(1 submission)</b></p>	Yes (1d)	A new short term and long term target has been added regarding the levels of targeted finfish in sanctuary zones and non-targetted fish in other zones. The surrogates to be used for this value will be determined by the marine science program.
228	<p>The 2nd paragraph on p54 states that Comet Bay is “the main feeding area of the little penguin”. Our organisation’s understanding is that little penguins feed in the waters of Cockburn Sound, Shoalwater Bay, Warnbro Sound and Comet Bay (with a restricted foraging range when rearing chicks) and is not aware of any evidence that suggests Comet Bay is the main feeding ground. If there is a reference that supports this statement, please include it, or remove the words “the main” and replace them with “a”. <b>(1 submission)</b></p>	Yes (1e)	The text has been amended to state that Comet Bay is the main foraging ground for the little penguin when rearing chicks and a reference for this information has been inserted.
<b>9.1.12 Invertebrates</b>			
229	<p>The management planning process for the marine park began with the declaration of the marine park boundary in 1990. Local community groups such as the Friends of the Shoalwater Islands Marine Park provided submissions on the initial draft management plan in January 1995, more than 11 years ago. Many respondents at the time objected to the plan</p>	Yes (1d)	A new short term and long term target has been added regarding the levels of targeted invertebrates in sanctuary zones and non-targetted invertebrates in other zones. The surrogate to be used for this value is western rock lobster.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>because it did not provide any no-take areas or sanctuary zones. The presence of marine park compliance resources would have a much-needed benefit for the management of the associated nature reserve islands (the subject of a Conservation Commission management plan). Given that it is politically inconceivable that the sanctuary zone issue will be resolved in the current planning cycle we propose another approach. The commercial and recreational fishing industries frequently claim that marine biodiversity conservation measures can be met using fisheries management instruments (ie. without closing areas to fishing). Perhaps it is time to test this in the marine park. It is proposed that we add new biodiversity objectives to the invertebrates value: to ensure an increase in the density and size of western rock lobsters within the marine park during the life of the plan. The onus should be placed on DoF and recreational and commercial fishers to implement management strategies that might achieve these objectives. The outcomes should be independently monitored in pre-selected limestone reef habitats using fixed parallax video camera technologies. The targets should be a documented increase in the density and size of the rock lobsters at the pre-selected reef habitat monitoring sites. Failure to meet these targets should see the introduction of CAR sanctuary zones over limestone reef and pavement habitats in the next plan. (1 submission)</p>		
<b>9.2.1 Aboriginal heritage</b>			
230	<p>More emphasis on indigenous culture (s submissions). In addition to the above statement, submissions also made one or more of the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Birds and animal names, stories, law etc. (1 sub)</li> <li>• Must include zoning of area for indigenous culture and law (1 sub).</li> <li>• Indigenous cultural significance as per the plan is listed as high. It is also noted education and interpretation is listed as medium to high with the support of DEC eco-education aboriginal cultural programs. A suitable venue to be located, such as visitor centre on Penguin Island, with Education Department or other site. I would recommend the marine focus group gives this the appropriate attention (2 subs).</li> <li>• Must take into account <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i> (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2d)	<p>The plan recognises the importance of aboriginal heritage and contains numerous strategies regarding involvement, education and interpretation. Cultural sites are already protected under the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i> and further protection was not deemed necessary.</p>
231	<p>Note the unnecessary 'are' in third paragraph (1 submission).</p>	Yes (1e)	<p>Text amended.</p>
<b>9.2.2 Maritime heritage</b>			

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
232	There may be merit in Tourism WA being involved in raising and enhancing awareness of the maritime history values of the marine park along with the Western Australian Maritime Museum, Department of Sport and Recreation and DEC. As such, it is recommended that the second strategy within paragraph 9.2.2 of the plan be amended to include reference to Tourism WA as a relevant referral organisation ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Yes (1d)	The second strategy in section 9.2.2 has been amended to include Tourism WA as a referral agency.
<b>9.2.3 Marine nature-based tourism</b>			
233	Please get the ferry boat to have their propellers fully enclosed, similar to life saving boats, but fully enclosed. This would protect the seals as they tend to want to play at this end, it would cost little and have little effect on performance ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2c)	This issue is beyond the scope of the plan.
234	It is noted that marine nature-based tourism in the marine park is rapidly expanding and that this will enhance visitor experience and help foster a greater understanding of the environment. Tourism WA's "A Nature Based Tourism Strategy for WA" promotes a model which recognises that visitor experience is at the heart of sustainable nature based tourism. Whilst other factors such as communication, product enhancement and marketing are important, the development of 'visitor experience' is paramount. Our organisation is therefore keen to ensure that the strategies outlined in the plan actually enhance visitor experience to the fullest extent possible. Tourism WA should be consulted if there is any move to change or restrict 'T' class licences in the marine park and there may also be merit in Tourism WA being involved in raising and enhancing awareness of nature-based tourism operators regarding the possible detrimental impacts on marine nature-based tourism within the marine park. As such, it is recommended that the 4th strategy in 9.2.3 be amended to include reference to Tourism WA as a relevant referral agency ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	Yes (1d)	The fourth strategy in section 9.2.3 has been amended to include Tourism WA as a referral agency.
<b>9.2.4 Commercial fishing</b>			
235	Remove commercial fishing from the marine park ( <b>2 submissions</b> ).	No (2e)	Removing commercial fishing would be inconsistent with the statutory purpose of marine parks; they are intended to provide for recreational and other uses consistent with the primary conservation objective and the Government's multiple-use policy. It would thus not represent a balanced outcome.
236	Professional fishers must be excluded from the bay, 1km west of Seal Island. They catch too	No (2e)	The community expressed highly divergent views on how

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
237	many lobsters and pollute the waters with discarded bait fish. <b>(1 submission)</b>  If we go ahead with such a high percentage of the park being dedicated to commercial fishing, it'll make it very difficult to reduce it should its impact be accepted as counterproductive (which it is, whatever any scientific report chooses to say). I think we need to start putting into the public's mind the notion of 'commercial free' conservation areas. I think we make too many concessions to commercial interests. I know that fishing is employment but I am yet to see a poor lobster fisherman, except for perhaps the people who work for them <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2e)	the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.  The community expressed highly divergent views on how the marine park should be managed. The Government has approved a zoning scheme that represents a balance between conservation and social use objectives. The zoning scheme and suite of management strategies (sections 7-9) will assist in conserving the habitats and species of the marine park.
238	The definition of unattended line fishing is not grammatically correct <b>(1 submission)</b> .	Yes (1e)	Text amended.
<b>9.2.5 Aquaculture</b>			
239	A good balance of sanctuary and use areas achieved but consider future aquaculture needs i.e. if it is eco sustainable why restrict it? <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Aquaculture is not appropriate in some areas due to a number of factors including insufficient water movement and flushing, the increased possibility of wildlife entanglement and high recreational use. Applications for aquaculture facilities are assessed considering factors such as these and the approved management plan.
240	It is understood that mussel farming occurs in Warnbro Sound and marking of this site with navigation warning buoys is required <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2c)	Marking of aquaculture infrastructure with appropriate navigation markers is the responsibility of the licence holder and is beyond the scope of the plan.
<b>9.2.6 Recreational fishing</b>			
241	Remove spearfishing from the marine park – this may help the marine life come back to the bay <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	Spearfishing is restricted in the sanctuary and special purpose zones, but removing it entirely would be inconsistent with the statutory purpose of marine parks; they are intended to provide for recreational and other

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
242	As for changing the fishing rules, I really can't see much point in that, what with the penguin population increasing from a couple of hundred to twelve hundred and the seals and pelicans who have adopted our islands must certainly have their quota of fish, so I think everyone catches a feed. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	uses consistent with the primary conservation objective and the Government's multiple-use policy. It would thus not represent a balanced outcome.  The primary purpose of the marine park is to provide for recreational and other uses consistent with the primary conservation objective and the Government's multiple-use policy. Scientific evidence has shown that recreational fishing can have an effect on marine biodiversity, but there are still areas within the marine park available for recreational fishing.
243	Stopping recreational fishing in Shoalwater Bay is a joke. Low life politicians telling us how to live our lives again, young people love to fish along the beaches. When the developers move into the area and more "yuppies" things will change again. Where do the politicians and their yuppie hanger ons want to go next - Mangles Bay <b>(1 submission)?</b>	No (2e)	Recreational fishing is still available in over 94 per cent of the marine park. Most forms of recreational fishing are still permitted in Shoalwater Bay.
244	The preparation of the very expensive report on our marine park shows the Government doesn't listen to the local public. A sad but true statement. Every year we catch tailor and whiting within the proposed Seal Island Sanctuary Zone. Tailor can not be caught anywhere else in the Sound. The report doesn't address this issue <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2e)	Recreational fishing is allowed in over 84 per cent of the marine park and tailor can be caught at other locations.
245	I moved to the area for safe fishing for myself and children <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2e)	Recreational fishing is still available in over 94 per cent of the marine park.
246	Differentiate between high impact boat fishing and low impact beach fishing <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2e)	No sanctuary zones are adjacent to the coastline (except for Seal Island, however access to the island is prohibited). Beach fishing is therefore still available in all areas of the marine park.
247	The plan does not provide any evidence of 'overfishing' in terms of recruitment overfishing, that is, there is no evidence to suggest that current levels of fishing are causing adult stocks to be reduced to the extent that recruits produced are insufficient to maintain current populations. The plan makes reference to recreational fishing as influencing changes in fish populations and abundance, despite providing no evidence to support these claims. An example of these concerns includes section 9.2.6 Recreational fishing, "A number of	Yes (1e)	Section 9.2.6 has been updated and unsubstantiated statements removed. The section has also been updated to reflect the changes that have occurred to pink snapper fishing rules. Spearfishing remains prohibited in the Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation) due to an unacceptable risk of incidents

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>factors, including past fishing practices, have contributed to changes in fish populations and abundance”. Such a statement should not be included unless supported with referenced scientific research in the region, without this the statement is purely an opinion. Another example includes this exert from section 9.2.6, “Spearfishing has the potential to cause such disturbance to fish communities so that populations can quickly become wary of humans. This in turn reduces the recreational and educational experiences of divers and snorkellers”. Our organisation seriously questions the ability of fish to differentiate between a diver carrying a spear gun, which is proposed to be banned and a cray loop which would be legal. Making anthropomorphic associations with marine fauna is nonsensical and by no means supported with scientific evidence. These statements are particularly inflammatory towards recreational fishing and are by no means supported by scientific evidence. The plan should provide an objective assessment of the risks which unfortunately we believe this is lacking. Our organisation is disappointed that Section 9.2.6 fails to mention that a significant fish breeding and spawning activity is already protected in the marine park through the ban on the take of pink snapper during their spawning period, as determined by extensive fisheries research and with support from recreational anglers. This is a pertinent example of where a risk to a fish population has been recognised and proper remedial action taken. The recreational sector largely initiated and lobbied for this increased protection, however, unfortunately this stewardship has not been recognised in the plan. Our organisation believes the plan unfairly discriminates between recreational line fishing and spearfishing. Our organisation shares the view of the DoF that spearfishing should be treated equally as a legitimate form of recreational fishing unless there are substantiated sustainability concerns about spearfishing for a particular species and/or in particular places. Those concerns would be best handled by specific, focussed fisheries management controls which limit the number of fish of those species which can be taken using those methods in specific places or specific situations. Currently there is no scientific evidence to suggest that recreational spearfishing is having a greater impact on the marine environment than recreational line fishing. These two forms of fishing should be treated equally in zoning decisions unless a greater threat by one or the other can be identified (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>		<p>involving the spearing of Australian sea lions.</p>



No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
<b>9.2.7 Recreational water sports</b>			
General comments			
248	The only permissible use of motor vessels inside the sanctuary zones should be for DEC approved ecotourism operators, volunteer sea rescue and government vessels from DEC, DoF, Water Police and so on. Similarly, where backup vessels are needed for any Education Department water based excursions temporary permits might be made available for such intrusions as in the case of ‘sea-trek’ sailing expeditions, snorkelling or kayaking. This would still enable our young to engage in ocean going ventures safely and ensure sites such as Cape Peron Camp School or the local Rockingham SHS Marine Studies Program is not disadvantaged ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2e)	Restriction of vessels in sanctuary zones is the manner suggested is not required to ensure protection of the marine park’s ecological values.
249	Kite, sailboarding and motor boats should be banned because I have seen the penguins with limbs missing. It’s a small loss for the community and big game for the future ( <b>1 submission</b> )	No (2e)	An eight knot speed limit will apply within the Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose and Seal Island Sanctuary Zones from 1 July 2008 to assist in minimising boat strikes to little penguins and other large marine wildlife. In this area kite surfers, windsurfers and non-motorised craft will be encouraged to comply.
250	Table 2 states permitted uses in each proposed zone of the marine park. Footnote (c) denotes motorised boating (as well sailing, kayaking, windsurfing and/or kite surfing) as being a suitable activity in the sanctuary or special purpose zones “subject to an 8 knot speed limit within 200m of mainland and island shores”, however p 50 states that to manage seabirds in the park, the speed of vessels will be restricted to 8 knots within a minimum of 200m of islands and mainland foreshores within the Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation) and Sanctuary Zones. Furthermore, p 69 (3rd dot point) states that vessel speeds are to be restricted to 8 knots within the Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation) and Sanctuary Zones when within a minimum of 200m of island or mainland shores. It is assumed that the boating speed restrictions will apply in the Sanctuary Zones and this should be acknowledged in the Table 2 (footnote) and elsewhere in the text where it only mentions the 200m proximity from the mainland/islands, otherwise restricted speed limitations will not apply in the Becher Point Sanctuary Zone and Murray Reef Special Purpose Zone where the majority of these zones are more than 200m from the closest island or the mainland. The plan clearly needs to clarify whether the proposed	Yes (1e)	Table 2 and the text have been amended and the issue regarding speed limits and parasailing clarified. That is, an eight knot speed limit will apply within the Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose and Seal Island Sanctuary Zones from 1 July 2008 to assist in minimising boat strikes to little penguins and other large marine wildlife. In this area kite surfers, windsurfers and non-motorised craft will be encouraged to comply.

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>removal of the gazetted water ski area in Shoalwater Bay will exclude any further skiing/parasailing in the Special Purpose Zone (Wildlife Conservation). Table 2 states that they will not be accepted uses (although motorised boats can use this area at the 8 knot speed limit), however, the text states that skiing/parasailing and high-speed freestyle motorised water sports will be “restricted” (does not say “excluded”). It is unclear what ‘restricted use’ will be and should be included as a footnote in Table 2. In addition, there is likely to be conflict between the Becher Point Sanctuary Zone and the overlapping water ski area and it is recommended that a review of this boundary be considered or suitable markers/signs be put in place to advise skiers/boat users of the location of the sanctuary zone to avoid conflict in this area(1 submission).</p>		
<p>Waterskiing/parasailing/high-speed freestyle motorised water sports</p>			
<p><b>Submitters ticked “support the removal of” on the submission form</b></p>			
251	<p>Individuals supported the proposal but provided no additional comment (25 submissions).</p>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
252	<p>Submissions supported the removal from Shoalwater Bay but believed other or alternative areas should be, or are already, available for these activities (9 submissions). Submissions suggested one of more of the following alternate locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety Bay (1 sub).</li> <li>• Warnbro (1 sub).</li> <li>• Waikki (2 subs).</li> <li>• Kwinnana Beach (1 sub).</li> <li>• Cockburn Sound (2 subs).</li> <li>• Warnbro Sound (1 sub).</li> <li>• Mangles Bay-Palm Beach area (1 sub).</li> <li>• The north facing beach immediately west of Garden Island bridge (1 sub).</li> <li>• No water ski area should be permitted between Cape Peron and First Rock (1 sub).</li> </ul> <p>Submissions provided one or more of the following reasons for their support of removing these activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would make the area safer for the recreational users. If an area is to be set aside for this use it should be away from the main recreational use areas (2 subs).</li> <li>• It would also allow for a better breeding environment (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2a)	High speed activities will be removed from Shoalwater Bay via the application of an eight knot speed limit which will apply within the Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose and Seal Island Sanctuary Zones from 1 July 2008. In this area kite surfers, windsurfers and non-motorised craft will be encouraged to comply.
253	<p>Submissions supported removing these activities from the whole marine park (8</p>	No (2e)	Removing these activities would be inconsistent with the

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p><b>submissions).</b>                      Submissions provided one or more of the following reasons for their support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This area should only be for small impact activities such as canoeing, small dinghies and sailing as this area is the safest for family outings in small boats. It is incompatible with high speed activities (1 sub).</li> <li>• I don't think these sports are compatible with a marine conservation park, particularly fast powerboats and jet skis (1 sub).</li> <li>• People who wish to use these machines should do so far away from the marine park area (2 subs).</li> <li>• There is plenty of coastline for these activities (1 sub).</li> </ul>		<p>statutory purpose of marine parks; they are intended to provide for recreational and other uses consistent with the primary conservation objective and the Government's multiple-use policy. It would thus not represent a balanced outcome. However, an eight knot speed limit will apply within the Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose and Seal Island Sanctuary Zones from 1 July 2008. In this area kite surfers, windsurfers and non-motorised craft will be encouraged to comply.</p>
254	<p>I think it would be a terrible shame, if the jet skis and the like were to be allowed to continue nipping across our bay. We must endeavour to retain our last slice of nature as much as we can before the money hungry developers get their greedy little hands on Cape Peron. I can see skyscrapers and huge non moving yachts all backing on to the Environment Centre, its so unfair after all the work the Centre and the volunteers have put in to make a success of this fabulously educational project <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	No (2a)	<p>Support for the plan.</p>
255	<p>Put education signs around the areas from the animal's point of view that tell a story explaining why. Educational signs about the importance of passive appreciation of conservation areas and the damage motorised water sports do <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	No (2d)	<p>The development and implementation of an education and interpretation program is a key strategy in the plan, and signage and education materials will be prepared to ensure users are aware of relevant information for the marine park.</p>
256	<p>Monitor jet ski use <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	No (2d)	<p>The plan contains a strategy which specifies separating incompatible water sports. Should jet ski use become an issue in the future, alternative management actions will be investigated.</p>
257	<p>Removal of motorised vessels from Shoalwater Bay <b>(3 submissions)</b>.                      In addition to the above statement, submissions also made one or more of the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage yacht charter (1 sub).</li> <li>• Increase license fees for all motorised vessels (1 sub).</li> <li>• Motorised vessels have high pollutants and target fish areas (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	<p>Removing motorised vessels from the area would be inconsistent with the statutory purpose of marine parks; they are intended to provide for recreational and other uses consistent with the primary conservation objective and the Government's multiple-use policy. It would thus not represent a balanced outcome. In addition, licence fees for motorised vessels are managed by DPI and are</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Motorised vessels are incompatible with seals and penguins, with exception of the boat that takes tourists to Penguin Island (1 sub).</li> </ul>		beyond the scope of the plan.
258	This is a relatively small area and the possibility of penguin kill is high. The vicinity of Seal Island increases the risk of disturbance here too (1 submission).	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
259	We are in accordance with boating restrictions, both to minimise impact on local fauna and to maintain and maximize the use of the park by different interest groups. Specifically, the removal of these activities would be advantageous for the various other groups of users. This would also minimise disturbance of the marine life in these Special Purpose and Sanctuary Zones. For general users, these boating restrictions will maintain the ambience, the tranquillity and the natural beauty of the area (1 submission).	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
260	In Ireland we have had several incidences where the presence of jet skis and water skiing have had serious effects on wildlife for a considerable distance, and in some cases have reduced numbers due to interference with feeding and breeding. Many of the birds on the islands within the plan feed away from the shore and will be in conflict with water sports. In no manner of forward thinking can water sports be said to enhance the marine life in area renown for its little penguins, sea lions and other wildlife. In particular, do you think the presence of jet skis, water skiing and spear fishing is really enhancing the marine life in area renown for its little penguins, sea lions and underwater beauty (1 submission)?	No (2a)	High speed activities will be removed from Shoalwater Bay via the application of an eight knot speed limit which will apply within the Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose and Seal Island Sanctuary Zones from 1 July 2008. In this area kite surfers, windsurfers and non-motorised craft will be encouraged to comply.
261	Our organisation is of the view that the appropriate management of boating and water sports in the marine park is essential. As such the restriction of waterskiing, parasailing and high speed motorised water sports in sanctuary zones as well as the removal of the Shoalwater Bay water ski area is supported. This will ensure that the disturbance of flora and fauna and conflict between users will be kept to an absolute minimum and will also add to the visitor experience to the marine park. However, there is a need to ensure that any actions taken are managed in a way where there will be minimal impacts on commercial tourism operators (if any) (1 submission).	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
262	Absolutely they are completely at odds with the conservation values inherent in this area. They create noise pollution and unacceptable wake. There is considerable anecdotal evidence to suggest that additional pressures are being placed upon the fauna and flora within the marine park through an increase in the number of watercraft and associated kiting activities. It is important to note that the types of activities which predominate, e.g. jet skis	No (2a)	High speed activities will be removed from Shoalwater Bay via the application of an eight knot speed limit which will apply within the Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose and Seal Island Sanctuary Zones from 1 July 2008. In this area kite surfers, windsurfers and non-motorised craft will

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>are also creating conflict with other, more passive users, such as small dinghy/yacht sailors and windsurfers. It is surprising, given the propensity of many of these types of craft within a relatively tight space and in relation to the local launching ramps that a fatality has not yet occurs. There chances of an accidental boat/board strike on wildlife are far greater than they have been in the past. I have witnessed both strikes to birds (shags) and seals from windsurfers and jet skis in the 15 years that I have lived on the coast. Water-skiing needs to be barred because of the noise, pollution from the 2 stroke engines, the area required for this to occur without conflicting with other users and the fragile nature of the ecology within the marine park. It would be better banned from the entire area along the bob-skis and other similar equipment. The distance with which many jet-skiers pass the islands is completely unacceptable, they often disturb nesting birds and interrupt their feeding patterns and parenting behaviours. Perhaps the only vessels suitable for this area are small dinghies under sail, kayaks and wave skis. Many sailboards still have the capacity for excessive speed and thus can create a jarring collision with marine life. It is, in my view, far better to 'over-regulate' in respect of this issue earlier rather than try to bring further more stringent measures at a later time (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>		<p>be encouraged to comply.</p>
<p><b>Submitters ticked "do not support the removal of" on the submission form</b></p>			
263	<p>Individuals did not support the proposal (<b>3 submissions</b>).</p>	<p>No (2e)</p>	<p>In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government. They considered this in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the inconsistency regarding vessel speeds, the relatively low proportion of the community actively using the area for water skiing on a regular basis and the alternative water skiing opportunities available. They recommended that the water ski area be removed and an 8 knot speed limit apply from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.</p>
264	<p>As there is little or no evidence to support the banning of water skiing from the long established water ski area, I propose the following be adopted until suitable research into the impact that water skiing as on the area has been conducted; A number of statements were made at the Shoalwater Marine Park workshop held in Rockingham on the 16th of</p>	<p>No (2e)</p>	<p>In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government. They considered this in conjunction with</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>September by conservation members; 1. “Penguins have been killed by boats”, when challenged only two deaths have been recorded over the last 1.5 years and they were found out at sea. (At this stage (4th of October) I have not had a reply from the numerous contacts with the Department of Environment and Conservation requesting for more information on penguin injuries. 2. “Injuries include prop and hull strikes” these injuries have not been investigated as to what type of boats have inflicted these injuries (i.e. ski boats as apposed to ferries, fishing, and sight seeing boats that are not proposed to be banned from the area). Just recently it was reported in the Saturday’s News paper (7.9.2006) that a whale swam into the propeller of a large support vessel. This proves that speed is not the only factor when it comes to animal injuries. The same accident could happen with a slow moving ferry or large boats operating outside the marine park. 3. “Fast moving, erratic turning boats are responsible for injuring the penguins because they do not have enough time to avoid the boats” if a penguin or sea lion are manoeuvrable enough catch a white bait or food then it should be able to out-manoeuver a boat if it was to be in that situation in the first place. 4. “Ski boats move quick and turn erratically” Water skiing requires a boat to travel in a reasonable straight line or slow circle at a constant speed otherwise the skier will loose momentum and sink. This is why the private ski park and competition courses are in straight lines with a turn around at each end. 5. Ski boats are disturbing the habitat. i. Arial photographs of the ski area indicate that there is no damage to the sea grass as apposed to the damage to seagrass near the Penguin island ferry landing. ii. More than 90% of marine motors sold today that are suitable for water skiing comply to very stringent USA and EU-EPA standards which have very stringent noise and pollution levels designed to protect inland fresh water habitats. 6. The sea lion population has increased from 4 to 5 some thirty five years ago to approximately 35 or more we see there today. This does not indicate that there has been any negative effect on this population. The plan appears to be a document that has been produced without consultation with all user groups such as the Water Ski Association or recreational users. I believe because of this, serious errors have been made in the document that may have misled the public and the focus group. The document does not provide any evidence that would support the removal of the established water-ski area from the marine park. The following points should be considered before any decision is made to remove water skiing from the area; Issues/inaccuracies with the plan 1. The illustrated ski area in the proposal is nearly two thirds larger than the actual ski area. This graphical misrepresentation suggests that water skiing activities are conducted in and around the islands and may impact on the wildlife. The actual ski area is at least 200 metres from any island. 2. The report states that the water ski area was declared in 2003 (page 69). This is a false statement as the ski areas was first declared on 11th of October 1963. This false</p>		<p>the primary purpose of the zone, the inconsistency regarding vessel speeds, the relatively low proportion of the community actively using the area for water skiing on a regular basis and the alternative water skiing opportunities available. They recommended that the water ski area be removed and an 8 knot speed limit apply from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan. DEC acknowledges that the waterski area was gazetted in 1963 and not in 2003 as stated in the plan.</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
265	<p>information has the capacity to mislead the Focus Group and general public. It gives a misleading impression that water skiing activities have only recently been conducted in the Shoalwater Bay area. 3. In the proposal and the submission form, water skiing is grouped together with high speed, freestyle motorised water sports and parasailing; this may give the public the impression that these sports are similar, when they are not. Water skiing has no similarities to these other sports. According to the DPI parasailing is only allowed in the gazetted water ski area within Warnbro Sound. It is inaccurate to suggest that the Shoalwater area is used for parasailing when it is not a designated area. To enable the public to make an informed judgment for the submission, I believe that these activities should be listed and ranked individually. This would enable a person to select only one of the activities if they felt that the other activities would have an impact on the environment. I believe that there are fundamental errors and misinformation in the plan. These are: 1. There has been no evidence or research that has been produced to justify the banning of water skiing in the area. 2. There is no indication that a risk assessment has been conducted prior to making any decisions effecting water skiers. 3. Not all stakeholders that are affected by the proposal have been invited or are represented on the focus group. This can lead to poor decision making and develops a bias within the group. The inclusion of all stakeholders impacted by the plan provides an opportunity for an open and transparent debate, these groups will claim ownership and empower the final plan. 4. The State Governments strategic direction for Recreation is compromised by this proposal by the removal of a long established area where families have been able to conduct recognised social and physical activities that can contribute to the community's wellbeing. The following are some of the key focus areas and desired outcomes from the Sports and Recreation strategic plan; a. Infrastructure All Western Australians, regardless of the level at which they participate, their means or geographical location, have access to quality sport and recreation facilities. b. Participation A more physically active society in which sport and recreation maintains and increases its contribution to community wellbeing (<b>4 submissions</b>).</p> <p>I would ban the jet skis/skidoos and kite surfers in the bay as they pose a threat to the wildlife in the area. Have them relocate around to Mangles Bay. The number of times we have seen some of these 'hoon' harass/terrorise dolphins and sea lions on Seal Island is shocking. Kite surfers are a problem for wildlife around Penguin Island. Also reinforce the bans. Waterskiing down near the holiday units in Shoalwater bay if controlled is ok (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2e)	In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government. They considered this in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the inconsistency regarding vessel speeds, the relatively low proportion of the community actively using the area for water skiing on a regular basis and the alternative water skiing

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
266	<p>This is the only sheltered water ski zone in the area that is usable for the majority of the summer, wind permitting. I can see no benefit to removing the water ski area unless a complete ban on power boats is imposed in the Shoalwater Bay Special Purpose Zone. The people that use the water ski area are generally only in that area and generally obey the rules. However the other users of the marine park, and I include snorkellers, divers, power boats, canoeists and the commercial tour boats are constantly breaking the rules. We regularly visit Seal and Penguin Island areas and every time we see someone walking on a No Landing area or a boat landed on the beach (sometimes one of the tour boats, whose skipper should know better). Current speed limits are also ignored on a regular basis. There is absolutely no point in bringing in more regulations and restrictions if they are not going to be enforced. I strongly believe that if the current regulations and restrictions were obeyed and indeed enforced then there would be no need for any changes. More education of the users of the area to the regulations would be of more benefit. As regards noise, the water ski area is bounded by a dog beach. There is usually more noise from barking dogs heard 200 metres offshore than from boat engines <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	No (2e)	<p>opportunities available. They recommended that the water ski area be removed and an 8 knot speed limit apply from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.</p> <p>In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government. They considered this in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the inconsistency regarding vessel speeds, the relatively low proportion of the community actively using the area for water skiing on a regular basis and the alternative water skiing opportunities available. They recommended that the water ski area be removed and an 8 knot speed limit apply from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan. With the gazettal of the management plan additional resources will be available to achieve the strategies outlined in the plan, including patrol and enforcement and education.</p>
267	<p>For parasailing, I don't think it bothers anyone and generally waterskiing takes place above the water <b>(1 submission)</b>.</p>	No (2e)	<p>In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government. They considered this in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the inconsistency regarding vessel speeds, the relatively low proportion of the community actively using the area for water skiing on a regular basis and the alternative water skiing opportunities available. They recommended that the water ski area be removed and an 8 knot speed limit apply from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.</p>
268	<p>Definitely no removal. I do not believe that accurate and responsible consultation was made</p>		<p>In determining a management position, the MPRA</p>



No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>by all the users of the area (e.g. waterskiiers). This is a misconception that because these boats are thought to be "fast and erratic" then they will be detrimental to the area. This is blatantly not true and the proof that this has been a designated ski area since the 1960s without ill effect to the environment (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>		<p>carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government. They considered this in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the inconsistency regarding vessel speeds, the relatively low proportion of the community actively using the area for water skiing on a regular basis and the alternative water skiing opportunities available. They recommended that the water ski area be removed and an 8 knot speed limit apply from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan. Continued public consultation with local user groups and stakeholders were conducted throughout the entire planning process. Individuals interested in waterskiing were also represented on the Focus Group.</p>
269	<p>There is no reason to suspect that these activities affect wildlife (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2e)	<p>In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government. They considered this in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the inconsistency regarding vessel speeds, the relatively low proportion of the community actively using the area for water skiing on a regular basis and the alternative water skiing opportunities available. They recommended that the water ski area be removed and an 8 knot speed limit apply from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.</p>
270	<p>Having read through the plan, I find some misrepresentations regarding information relating to the ski area and to the sport of water skiing. Our organisation strongly opposes any closure of water ski areas. We believe we have a duty to not only retain, but to increase and improve water ski areas for our increasing population. The Shoalwater Bay and Safety Bay Water ski areas are not heavily used, as are some other ski areas in the metropolitan areas, but the area is convenient for the people in and around the Rockingham area. I have also noticed that there are a number of misrepresentations regarding information pertaining to water skiing in the Shoalwater Bay area. The reports states that the water ski area was</p>	No (2e)	<p>In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government. They considered this in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the inconsistency regarding vessel speeds, the relatively low proportion of the community actively using the area for water skiing on a regular basis and the alternative water skiing</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	<p>declared in 2003 (p69). This is incorrect as it was declared in 1963 and this information can be confirmed by DPI. The illustrative area in the proposal is larger than the actual ski area. This suggests water skiing is conducted around the islands and may impact on wildlife. The true ski area is some 200 metres away from the island. It is also incorrect to suggest water skiing is related in any way to the use of jet skis and Personal Water Craft. Waterskiing has no similarities with high speed motorised water sport. Many of the water skiers using this area are family groups and are all responsible people who observe the rules and aim to do the right thing in preserving the area. The suggestion of water skiing having an impact on the wildlife in the area, and the desecration of sea grass, seems to be misleading as no study has found this to be the case. It would seem that more focus on the existing potential hazards, such as the discharge of toxicants, nutrients, litter and introduced pests entering the water would be more of a concern and would have more of an impact on the environment (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>		<p>opportunities available. They recommended that the water ski area be removed and an 8 knot speed limit apply from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan. DEC acknowledges that the waterski area was gazetted in 1963 and not in 2003 as stated in the plan.</p>
<p>8 knot speed limit within 200m of island &amp; mainland shores in Shoalwater Bay and sanctuary zones</p>			
<p><b>Submitters ticked “support” on the submission form</b></p>			
271	<p>Individuals supported the speed limit but provided no additional comment (<b>27 submissions</b>).</p>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
272	<p>Submissions support the speed limit (<b>6 submissions</b>).                      Submissions provided one or more of the following reasons for their support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will minimise shoreline wash (2 subs).</li> <li>• To prevent injury and disturbance to wildlife (5 subs).</li> <li>• Safer for recreational users (swimmers and divers) (2 subs).</li> <li>• Promote passive boating, sailing and kayaking (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2a)	<p>In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the high wildlife values of the area and the potential risks to these animals. They recommended that the 8 knot speed limit apply to the whole zone from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.</p>
273	<p>Greater restrictions, including a removal of motorised vessels within the area (<b>5 submissions</b>).                      In addition to the above statement, submissions also made one or more of the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leave if for the animals and swimming activities (1 sub).</li> <li>• Motorised boats should only be permitted in an emergency or tourist licensed boats to Penguin Island (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2a)	<p>In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the high wildlife values of the area and the potential risks to these animals. They recommended that the 8 knot speed limit apply to the whole zone from 1</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
274	Speed limit to apply within how close to wildlife (1 submission)?	No (2c)	July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.
275	Wind powered craft (in line with international law) should be exempt from speed restrictions - in high winds it is often dangerous to fiddle with sails to lower speed (1 submission).	No (2a)	Vessel approach distances to wildlife in managed under other legislation such as the <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i> and are beyond the scope of the plan. Non-motorised vessels and craft will be encouraged to comply with the speed restrictions.
276	Increased enforcement is required (3 submissions).	No (2d)	With the gazettal of the management plan additional resources will be available to achieve the strategies outlined in the plan, including patrol and enforcement.
277	The changes would give the marine creatures room to move without being hit by a speedboat or jetski, there are many other appropriate areas for water vehicles with adequate space. There is too much being left to chance at the expense of our marine life. The whole of Shoalwater Bay should be restricted to an 8 knot speed limit to protect seals, sea lions, little penguins and dolphins as propeller strikes are the main cause of killing or maiming marine life in this area. In the past a snorkeller was hit by a boat going too fast, possibly its time to consider jet ski operators being licensed. We need to stop the negative impact being had on marine life (1 submission).	No (2a)	In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the high wildlife values of the area and the potential risks to these animals. They recommended that the 8 knot speed limit apply to the whole zone from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.
278	I think the islands are more critical than the mainland (1 submission).	No (2b)	No change sought.
279	Include wind surfers, paragliding and other non-motorised craft (3 submissions).	No (2d)	Non-motorised vessels and craft will be encouraged to comply with the speed restrictions.
280	We are in accordance with boating restrictions, both to minimise impact on local fauna and to maintain and maximize the use of the park by different interest groups. Specifically, speed limits enhance the kayaking experience, promote safety for paddlers and other non-motorised boating activities. This would also minimise disturbance of the marine life in these Special Purpose and Sanctuary Zones. For general users, these boating restrictions will maintain the ambience, the tranquillity and the natural beauty of the area (1 submission).	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
281	Ensure that paddle craft are able to paddle up to the islands (1 submission).	No (2d)	Paddle craft are able to access Penguin Island and to

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
282	<p>I think a 5 knot limit should be applied. Only craft belonging to DEC or DoF, DPI or other government agency should be allowed in excess of this or when rescue is required. There is a lot of sense behind a recommended speed limit of 8 knots within the most sensitive areas of the marine park area, as this generally speaking, should not be beyond the scope of most marine mammals, fish and bird life to evade collision in a close quarter's situation. Nevertheless, there is further ample scope to reduce this further to 5 knots given that the area proposed for the scientific and sanctuary zones is relatively small. Indeed, from an educative and sensory appreciation point of view, a slower trip would allow more people time to observe and understand conservation values with the marine park, thus reinforcing its unique nature and efforts at preservation. It goes without saying that the sea-state on any given day and the nature of the vessel traversing these waters, you will need to maintain a safe headway and, as such, may need to exceed this limit in the pursuit of passenger and vessel safety. Nevertheless, there is room to lower the maximum speed limit to an equivalent walking pace; thereby reducing noise emissions, wake and increasing time to avert potential collisions with marine creatures. The 200m zone is insufficient and should be extended in line with the aforementioned considerations and in light of my wider argument for higher conservation values reflected in an extended marine park area that follows. A further extended limit of 50 metres is suggested in respect to this matter. Where possible most power vessels should be encouraged not to venture into the most highly sensitive areas of the marine park and a further lowered speed limit might be one way of achieving this (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2e)	<p>approach within 5 m of the beach of Seal Island. Changes to the approach distance of Seal Island are managed by the <i>Shoalwater Islands Management Plan 1992-2002</i> and are beyond the scope of this plan.</p> <p>In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the high wildlife values of the area and the potential risks to these animals. They recommended that the 8 knot speed limit apply to the whole zone from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.</p>
<b>Submitters ticked “do not support” on the submission form</b>			
283	<p>Individuals did not support the speed limit but provided no additional comment (<b>1 submission</b>).</p>	No (2e)	<p>In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the high wildlife values of the area and the potential risks to these animals. They recommended that the 8 knot speed limit apply to the whole zone from 1</p>

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
284	It is fine the way it is (1 submission).	No (2e)	July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.  In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the high wildlife values of the area and the potential risks to these animals. They recommended that the 8 knot speed limit apply to the whole zone from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.
285	I would like to see your plan looks after kite surfers who play in the area around Penguin Island. The bay between Shoalwater, Penguin and Seal Islands is in my opinion the safest and best in Perth. In a normal sea breeze, ie south-wester, kite surfers who get into trouble will simply drift down wind and eventually end up on the beach, which means they can walk back to the Pengoes area (as opposed to being rescued). Kite surfers do provide a spectacle for the tourists who visit the area and of course are environmentally friendly. Has to be good for the environment and the local economy (1 submission).	No (2d)	Non-motorised vessels and craft will be encouraged to comply with the speed restrictions.
286	Increased restrictions (2 submissions). In addition to the above statement, submissions also made one or more of the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five knots would be better, 8 knots only in emergency. Need to lower speed in the area generally (also in the General Use Zone) as it is part of a fish nursery area (1 sub).</li> <li>• Restrict speed of water craft in all areas of special purpose zone with the exception of the gazetted water ski area (1 sub).</li> </ul>	No (2e)	In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by Government in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the high wildlife values of the area and the potential risks to these animals. They recommended that the 8 knot speed limit apply to the whole zone from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.
287	People would only ignore it and it would serve almost no purpose. Try educating people on why (1 submission).	No (2d)	With the gazettal of the management plan additional resources will be available to achieve the strategies outlined in the plan, including patrol and enforcement and education.
288	There is no evidence or indication that accidents have occurred to justify speed limits in these areas. All boat or watercraft operators must abide by the DPI marine regulations which govern speed. All incidents should be reported to the DPI and changes made according to	No (2e)	In determining a management position, the MPRA carefully considered the submissions received on the plan, the advice provided by the Focus Group and by

No	Summary of issues / Major Points Raised	Amendment (criteria)	Discussion/Action
	the DPI recommendations (4 submissions).		Government in conjunction with the primary purpose of the zone, the high wildlife values of the area and the potential risks to these animals. They recommended that the 8 knot speed limit apply to the whole zone from 1 July 2008. This advice is reflected in the plan.
<b>9.2.8 Coastal and island use</b>			
289	There are pressures on the coastal environment from lack of toilets and rubbish disposal facilities, in some locations particularly Cape Peron (1 submission).	No (2c)	The management of foreshores within the marine park are discussed in this section. Strategies within this section also specify working with adjacent land managers for areas outside the marine park.
<b>13. Appendices</b>			
290	Some unfamiliar words are used in the management plan, possibly a glossary could be included for the non-environmentally orientated reader. Words such as benthic, littoral, eutrophication could be defined (1 submission).	No (2d)	This will be further considered for future planning processes.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: Acronyms

CALM Act	<i>Conservation and Land Management Act 1984</i>
CAR	comprehensive, adequate and representative (marine protected area system)
CSMC	Cockburn Sound Management Council
DEC	Department of Environment and Conservation
DoF	Department of Fisheries
DoH	Department of Health
DoIR	Department of Industry and Resources
DPI	Department for Planning and Infrastructure
EP Act	<i>Environment Protection Act</i>
EPA	Environmental Protection Authority
KPI	key performance indicator
MAC	Management Advisory Committee
MPRA	Marine Parks and Reserves Authority
NH&MRC	National Health & Medical Research Council
NOPSA	National Offshore Petroleum Safety Authority
TWW	treated wastewater