

**JURIEN BAY MARINE RESERVE PROPOSAL
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAM**

ISSUES ANALYSIS

DRAFT

May 1998

Department of Conservation and Land Management
Marine Conservation Branch
47 Henry St . Fremantle. WA. 6160.

JURIEN BAY MARINE RESERVE PROPOSAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAM

STAGE I (b): ISSUES ANALYSIS

Introduction

Recent changes to the marine reserve provisions of the CALM Act now require extensive community and stakeholder involvement in the planning and establishment of marine conservation reserves in Western Australia. The involvement of marine reserve advisory committees in the planning and pre-Notice of Intent (NOI) stage is a key component in the formal stage of this consultative process. Post-NOI there is also a statutory three month public submission period. Although both the representative advisory committee and the public submission processes provide formal mechanisms to facilitate stakeholder and community input in the planning and establishment of marine reserves in Western Australia, there is also a need to involve the broader community more directly. The purpose of this involvement is to develop community ownership of, support for and participation in the conservation and management of their local environment. This is achieved through a Public Participation Program (PPP). A Public Participation Program is an iterative process by which interested and affected individuals and Government and non-government organisations are consulted and involved in the decision-making process. This process both informs and seeks a response from the public.

Effective Public Participation Programs :

- engender a sense of community support and compliance
- ensure the inclusion of expert knowledge and local experience in the planning process
- seek to resolve issues of conflict early in the planning process
- result in draft management plans which reconcile issues of conflict

As mentioned above public participation in the establishment and planning of marine reserves in Western Australia incorporates two phases of community involvement:

- Pre-NOI - primarily through the involvement of the stakeholder advisory committee and
- Post-NOI - via a statutory three month public submission process

The goal of the Jurien Bay Marine Reserve Public Participation Program is :

To develop community ownership of, support for and participation in the conservation and management of the marine environment of the Jurien Bay area

The objective of the Jurien Bay Marine Reserve Public Participation Program is:

To encourage and facilitate appropriate and effective public participation in the planning process for the Jurien Bay Marine Reserve

The Jurien Bay Marine Reserve Public Participation Program has three main stages:

STAGE I: Community profile

- a) **Database construction** - list of potential contacts, addresses, interests etc for the PPP
- b) **Issue analysis** - opinions, concerns etc

STAGE II: High profile community liaison

- a) **Pre- NOI**
- b) **Post- NOI**

STAGE III: Reserve declaration

This report summarises the results of the Jurien Bay Marine Reserve Public Participation Program Stage I (b): Issues Analysis.

Aims

The aims of the issue analysis are;

- assess community attitudes towards the Jurien Bay marine reserve proposal,
- assess levels of knowledge and understanding of the marine reserve concept and planning process,
- gain an understanding of alliances and conflicts within and among community groups,
- open channels of communication and develop rapport with key community members,
- provide information to key members of the community,
- identify appropriate methods and liaison pathways to facilitate effective participation in the reserve planning process.

Methods

To achieve these aims, a list of key contacts was developed with reference to the generic contact list in appendix I. Discussions were then arranged with the high priority contacts within each user or interest group. Following each discussion, the interviewer assessed and recorded i) attitude, ii) level of knowledge and understanding of the marine reserve concept and planning process, iii) issues raised by, or of concern to the contact, iv) the existence of conflicts and alliances associated with marine reserve issues, and v) incorrect rumours within the community. This information was recorded on the forms attached in appendix II in accordance with the instructions in appendix III.

The forms were then summarised to provide a basis for recommending strategies to be implemented during stage IIa of the ppp to address inadequate levels of knowledge and the potential for conflict within the community.

Results and discussion

Discussions were recorded with 100 contacts (Table 1). Of these, 63 people were contacted face to face, and 37 were contacted by phone. 79 interviews were with one person, 9 interviews were with 2 people and 8 interviews were with 3 people. Detailed written information and relevant documents were subsequently forwarded to many of these people by mail. In addition to the one-on-one and small group discussions, presentations were given to larger groups from the Professional Fishermen's Association in Cervantes and to the Marine Teachers Association in Perth. These presentations provided an opportunity to inform members and to gather feedback on the reserve proposal. However, the issues raised during these meetings did not add to those already identified in the discussion summary forms and have not been added to the summaries in this report. In addition, a further 21 people were contacted by mail only, because discussions could not be arranged.

The majority of effort was spent with local residents in the central west coast towns of Cervantes, Jurien Bay and Greenhead, together with both recreational and commercial fishers, plus local government staff and elected members. Written correspondence has been forwarded to an additional 15 people with Indigenous interests and further visits are planned to other groups which are less well represented in this analysis.

i) Attitudes

Before members of the community can have effective input into the reserve planning process, they need have a cooperative attitude and a minimum level of understanding. People who are strongly negative or hostile will not consider other points of view or accept new information. People who do not have a minimum level of understanding of the marine reserve concept and planning process will not be able to participate effectively in the planning process. The achievement of an appropriate attitude is therefore the first essential step towards facilitating effective public input into the planning process.

Table 1 The numbers of contacts made within each contact group

Contact group		No. of contacts
COMMUNITY MEMBERS		18
CM1	Local resident and rate payers	10
CM2	Aboriginal communities	3
CM3	Vacation visitors	5
CM4	Neighbouring land owners	0
CM5	Broader community	0
RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY GROUPS		27
R1	Boating	4
R2	Diving	2
R3	Fishing	13
R4	Surface water sports	4
R5	Nature study and collectors	2
R6	Shore based	2
INTEREST GROUPS		14
I1	Conservationists	6
I2	Scientists	4
I3	Educators	5
GOVERNMENT		16
G1	Local government	11
G2	State	5
G3	Commonwealth	0
G4	Parliament	0
INDUSTRY GROUPS		22
C1	Fishing	10
C2	Aquaculture	1
C3	Tourism	5
C4	Other commerce	6
PRESS		3
TOTAL		100

A summary of attitudes is provided in table 2. Of the 100 people contacted only two people were considered hostile at the beginning of the discussion. However, by the end of both of these discussions, the attitudes of these people were cautious and therefore receptive and far more constructive. The low level of hostility recorded within the community indicates that there is no need to implement a strategy to overcome hostility at this stage.

The high proportion of people who's attitude softened from cautious to receptive during the discussions is an indication that a significant cause of the caution is related to lack of knowledge and understanding of the marine reserve concept and planning process. The wide distribution of additional information during the next stage of the ppp is therefore expected to improve community attitudes.

While the numbers of discussions with representatives from many groups was low, the summaries indicate that the groups most cautious about the proposal are the commercial fishers, conservationists, local government staff and elected members and non resident shack owners. Continuing close liaison with these groups will be necessary to monitor attitudes.

Table 2. A summary of attitudes towards the reserve proposal both at the beginning and the end of discussions. Continued on the next page.

User Group	Attitude	Receptive	Cautious	Hostile
COMMUNITY MEMBERS	Beginning	12	6	1
	End	16	3	-
CM1 Local resident and rate payers	Beginning	8	3	-
	End	10	1	-
CM2 Aboriginal communities	Beginning	3	-	-
	End	3	-	-
CM3 Vacation visitors	Beginning	1	3	1
	End	3	2	-

Table 2 continued

User Group	Attitude	Receptive	Cautious	Hostile
RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY GROUPS	Beginning	18	8	-
	End	26	-	-
R1 Boating	Beginning	4	-	-
	End	4	-	-
R2 Diving	Beginning	1	1	-
	End	2	-	-
R3 Fishing	Beginning	12	1	-
	End	13	-	-
R4 Surface water sports	Beginning	1	3	-
	End	4	-	-
R5 Nature study and collectors	Beginning	-	2	-
	End	2	-	-
R6 Shore based	Beginning	1	1	-
	End	2	-	-
INTEREST GROUPS	Beginning	12	2	-
	End	13	1	-
I1 Conservationists	Beginning	4	2	-
	End	5	1	-
I2 Scientists	Beginning	4	-	-
	End	4	-	-
I3 Educators	Beginning	5	-	-
	End	5	-	-
GOVERNMENT	Beginning	11	4	-
	End	13	2	-
G1 Local government	Beginning	8	3	-
	End	9	2	-
G2 State	Beginning	3	1	-
	End	4	-	-
G3 Commonwealth	Beginning	-	-	-
	End	-	-	-
G4 Parliament	Beginning	-	-	-
	End	-	-	-
INDUSTRY GROUPS	Beginning	16	5	1
	End	18	4	-
C1 Fishing	Beginning	5	4	1
	End	6	4	-
C2 Aquaculture	Beginning	1	-	-
	End	1	-	-
C3 Tourism	Beginning	4	1	-
	End	5	-	-
C4 Other commerce	Beginning	6	-	-
	End	6	-	-
PRESS	Beginning	3	-	-
	End	3	-	-
TOTAL	Beginning	72	25	2
	End	89	10	-

ii) Levels of knowledge and understanding

Members of the community need to have a minimum level of understanding of both the marine reserve concept and planning process before they can effectively participate in planning and negotiate issues of conflict in a constructive manor.

Levels of knowledge and understanding of the marine reserve concept and planning process are summarised in table 3. While there was a reasonable level of knowledge relating to the values of the Jurien Bay area, very few of the contacts representing the category of general community had an adequate enough level of knowledge and understanding to participate effectively in reserve planning.

Table 3. Levels of knowledge and understanding. Note that not every discussion was assessed against all knowledge parameters so the numbers do not relate directly to the total number of people interviewed.

<u>Contact group</u>	<u>Levels of Knowledge and Understanding</u>	<u>Number of contacts</u>	<u>Number with Adequate understanding</u>
SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY MEMBERS	Values of proposed area	16	11
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	17	1
	Representativeness and no-take	13	1
	Sustainability	13	3
	Integrated Management	12	1
	Planning process and Public Participation	17	3
CM1 - Local residents and rate payers	Values of proposed area	10	8
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	9	1
	Representativeness and no-take	8	1
	Sustainability	9	3
	Integrated Management	8	1
	Planning process and Public Participation	9	3
CM2 - Aboriginal communities	Values of proposed area	2	1
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	3	0
	Representativeness and no-take	1	0
	Sustainability	1	0
	Integrated Management	1	0
	Planning process and Public Participation	3	0
CM3 - Vacation visitors	Values of proposed area	4	2
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	5	0
	Representativeness and no-take	4	0
	Sustainability	3	0
	Integrated Management	3	0
	Planning process and Public Participation	5	0

Assessment of those interviewed with recreational interests indicated that the comprehension level for most assessment points was approximately 50%. Sustainability was higher at 65% and the planning process was lower at 33%. These figures however, were heavily weighted by recreational fishing representatives who were members of Rec Fish West and Recreational Fishing Advisory Committees. While these contacts were understandably well informed, their impressions of the average fisher were that there was generally a low level of understanding and some significant miss conceptions.

Table 3 continued. Levels of knowledge and understanding. Note that not every discussion was assessed against all knowledge parameters so the numbers do not relate directly to the total number of people interviewed.

<u>Contact group</u>	<u>Levels of Knowledge and Understanding</u>	<u>Number of contacts</u>	<u>Number with Adequate understanding</u>
SUMMARY OF RECREATIONAL CONTACTS	Values of proposed area	25	13
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	25	12
	Representativeness and no-take	24	11
	Sustainability	26	17
	Integrated Management	23	10
	Planning process and Public Participation	27	9
R1 - Boating	Values of proposed area	4	2
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	3	1
	Representativeness and no-take	3	1
	Sustainability	4	2
	Integrated Management	3	2
	Planning process and Public Participation	4	2
R2 - Diving	Values of proposed area	2	1
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	2	1
	Representativeness and no-take	2	1
	Sustainability	2	1
	Integrated Management	2	1
	Planning process and Public Participation	2	1
R3 - Fishing	Values of proposed area	11	10
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	12	10
	Representativeness and no-take	11	9
	Sustainability	13	12
	Integrated Management	11	7
	Planning process and Public Participation	13	6
R4 - Surface Water Sports	Values of proposed area	4	0
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	4	0
	Representativeness and no-take	4	0
	Sustainability	3	0
	Integrated Management	3	0
	Planning process and Public Participation	4	0
R5 - Nature study and collectors	Values of proposed area	2	0
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	2	0
	Representativeness and no-take	2	0
	Sustainability	2	1
	Integrated Management	2	0
	Planning process and Public Participation	2	0
R6 - Shore Based activities	Values of proposed area	2	0
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	2	0
	Representativeness and no-take	2	0
	Sustainability	2	1
	Integrated Management	2	0
	Planning process and Public Participation	2	0

A summary of records from interest group representatives indicate that 85% of those interviewed understood the concept of sustainability and 46% understood the concept of representativeness. However, only 14% had an adequate knowledge of the reserve planning process.

Table 3 continued. Levels of knowledge and understanding. Note that not every discussion was assessed against all knowledge parameters so the numbers do not relate directly to the total number of people interviewed.

Contact group	Levels of Knowledge and Understanding	Number of contacts	Number with Adequate understanding
SUMMARY OF INTEREST GROUPS	Values of proposed area	14	6
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	14	5
	Representativeness and no-take	13	6
	Sustainability	13	11
	Integrated Management	12	4
	Planning process and Public Participation	14	2
I1 - Conservation	Values of proposed area	6	1
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	6	3
	Representativeness and no-take	6	3
	Sustainability	6	5
	Integrated Management	5	2
	Planning process and Public Participation	6	1
I2 - Scientists	Values of proposed area	3	2
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	3	1
	Representativeness and no-take	3	3
	Sustainability	3	3
	Integrated Management	2	1
	Planning process and Public Participation	3	0
I3 - Educators	Values of proposed area	5	3
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	5	1
	Representativeness and no-take	4	0
	Sustainability	4	3
	Integrated Management	5	1
	Planning process and Public Participation	5	1

Government representatives generally had an adequate knowledge of the values of Jurien Bay (73%) and 56% of those interviewed understood the concept of sustainability. However,, while the level of knowledge relating to the planning process was assessed as 47%, only 21% had an adequate knowledge of multiple-use and zoning.

High percentages of industry representatives had adequate knowledge of the values of Jurien Bay and the concept of sustainability. However, a low level of understanding was recorded in relation to the concept of representativeness (19%) and the planning process (28%).

The overall assessment of all contacts indicates that over 60% of those interviewed had an adequate knowledge of the values of Jurien Bay and the concept of sustainability. The percentage of people with sufficiently broad knowledge to have effective input into the planning process was however much lower. This survey has therefore highlighted the need for the preparation of information about all of the issues assessed, focusing particularly on the concept of multiple use and zoning and explaining the planning process. This information will need to be distributed widely to all contact groups utilising a the range of communication mediums listed in appendix IV. These actions will include;

- the production of a series of articles in the local Jurien Bay and Cervantes newspapers,
- the provision of information packs and display material for the Jurien Bay and Cervantes libraries,
- the provision of articles for group news letters and magazines,
- presentations and question/answer sessions at group meetings,
- the use of Email information distribution lists and websites,
- radio interviews,' and
- more one-on-one discussions.

Table 3 continued. Levels of knowledge and understanding. Note that not every discussion was assessed against all knowledge parameters so the numbers do not relate directly to the total number of people interviewed.

Contact group	Levels of Knowledge and Understanding	Number of contacts	No. with Adequate understanding
SUMMARY OF GOVERNMENT CONTACTS	Values of proposed area	15	11
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	14	3
	Representativeness and no-take	13	4
	Sustainability	9	5
	Integrated Management	13	5
	Planning process and Public Participation	15	7
G1 - Local Government	Values of proposed area	11	9
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	10	2
	Representativeness and no-take	10	3
	Sustainability	7	4
	Integrated Management	10	4
	Planning process and Public Participation	11	4
G2 - State Government	Values of proposed area	4	2
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	4	1
	Representativeness and no-take	3	1
	Sustainability	2	1
	Integrated Management	3	1
	Planning process and Public Participation	4	3
SUMMARY OF INDUSTRY CONTACTS	Values of proposed area	14	6
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	14	5
	Representativeness and no-take	13	6
	Sustainability	13	11
	Integrated Management	12	4
	Planning process and Public Participation	14	2
C1 - Commercial fishing	Values of proposed area	10	7
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	10	4
	Representativeness and no-take	10	2
	Sustainability	9	7
	Integrated Management	7	3
	Planning process and Public Participation	9	3
C2 - Aquaculture	Values of proposed area	1	1
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	1	1
	Representativeness and no-take	1	1
	Sustainability	1	1
	Integrated Management	1	1
	Planning process and Public Participation	1	1
C3 Tourism	Values of proposed area	5	5
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	4	1
	Representativeness and no-take	5	1
	Sustainability	5	3
	Integrated Management	3	0
	Planning process and Public Participation	4	1
C4 - Commercial and other	Values of proposed area	6	5
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	4	0
	Representativeness and no-take	5	0
	Sustainability	5	3
	Integrated Management	5	1
	Planning process and Public Participation	4	0

Table 3 continued. Levels of knowledge and understanding. Note that not every discussion was assessed against all knowledge parameters so the numbers do not relate directly to the total number of people interviewed.

Contact group	Levels of Knowledge and Understanding	Number of contacts	No. with Adequate understanding
Press	Values of proposed area	3	3
	Marine reserve multiple-use and zoning	2	0
	Representativeness and no-take	2	0
	Sustainability	1	0
	Integrated Management	3	0
	Planning process and Public Participation	2	0

iii) Issues raised

A summary of issues raised is provided in table 4.

Table 4. Issues raised during community discussions.

ISSUE	NO. OF PEOPLE	USER GROUPS RAISING THE ISSUE
Concern that no-take areas will result in loss of fishing ground	18	(CM1-3); (CM3-1); (R2-1); (R3-3); (G1-1); (C1-7); (C3-1); (C4-1)
Concerned about potential for negative effects on the tourism industry and recreation	7	(CM-1-1), (CM3-1); (G1-1); (C3-2), (R1-1), (R4-1)
Concerned about potential for negative impacts on crayfishing industry	8	(CM1-1); (G1-3); (G2-1); (C1-3)
Concerns relating to restrictions on current activities e.g. changes to bag limits, beach access for 4wd., lack of surfing access	4	(CM1-1); (CM5-1), (R3-1), (R4-1),
General confusion and fear within the community regarding impacts of the changes	4	(CM1-1); (I3-1); (G1-1); (C3-1)
Perception of under representation on the advisory committee	6	(R1-1); (R3-2); (G1-2); (C1-1)
Fear that this initial stage is just the thin edge of the wedge and once declared the boundaries will be changed without further consultation. General miss trust of government CALM and other agencies	7	(CM1-1); (G1-1); (C1-2) (C4-1), (G1-1), (R3-1), (R4-1),
Perceived power plays among government agencies and the relative strength of the various Acts	4	(R6-1), (I1-3)
Concerns about Aboriginal land claims on coast	5	(CM1-2); (CM2-1); (G1-1), (C3-1)
Community currently not considering proposal, possibly apathetic, need for community involvement/ education and information.	6	(CM1-1); (CM2-1), (R3-1); (I3-1); (G1-1), (G2-1)
compliance plus the logistics and cost of policing	7	(CM3-2); (CM5-1); (R1-1); (R3-1); (R6-1), (I1-1)
Concern that management to be paid for by commercial fishers	1	(CM5-1)
current wastage of fish dumped on tip	1	(CM-1)
perception that commercial net fishing takes too much fish	1	(CM1-5)
the appropriateness of line fishing from commercial rock lobster boats	1	(R3-1)
the use of scuba while spear fishing		(R3-1)
the appropriateness of beach netting	2	(CM1-1); (PRESS)
shack owners consider given an undertaking by DOLA that nothing would change before 2001	1	(CM3-1)
The effectiveness of no-take areas	2	(R3-1), (C1-1)
the need for correspondence between management plans for terrestrial reserves and marine reserve	1	(I1-1)

RESPONSE TO MAJOR ISSUES RAISED

The most appropriate forum to address the majority of the issues raised is the Jurien Bay Marine Reserve Advisory Committee.

Many of the issues raised related to the negative, rather than the positive, aspects or consequences of the reserve proposal. Although it is understandable that people focus on their concerns, the results suggest that the potential benefits of the proposed reserve may have been largely overlooked during discussions. Consequently increased emphasis will be given to the positive aspects of the proposed reserve in subsequent correspondence.

If the Minister declines to alter the membership of the advisory committee, the issue of perceived under representation could be addressed by advising groups that they could seek, via a formal request to the advisory committee chairman, observer status.

Cynicism of Government can be addressed through the continued demonstration that processes are equitable, transparent and accountable. This cynicism is unlikely to be overcome in the short-term. The stakeholder advisory committee approach and comprehensive public participation programmes will, hopefully, gradually increase public confidence that decisions will not be made without extensive stakeholder consultation. Committee members can also help by keeping the groups they represent continually informed.

Loss of confidence in Government processes that result from jurisdictional disputes between departments can be minimised if Government officers work co-operatively.

Low interest in the reserve proposal by parts of the local community is probably more a reflection that the reserve is considered unlikely to directly affect their interests rather than apathy. General information and educational material will be widely distributed in the next stage of the PPP.

Concerns relating to the management costs of the proposed reserve are partly addressed by the explanation that the reserve process incorporates an explicit statement to Cabinet of the resources needed (ie funds and staff) to establish and maintain the reserve. This issue also highlights the need to ensure the community has a clear understanding of the partnership role, with Government, they have in managing multiple-use marine reserves sustainably.

iv) Conflicts Identified During Discussions

A summary of the conflicts identified during discussions are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Existing and potential conflicts identified between user and interest groups.

CONFLICTING GROUPS	NO. OF PEOPLE REPORTING	USER GROUPS IDENTIFYING CONFLICT
Commercial and recreational fishers	16	CM1-2; CM2-1; CM5-1; R3-2; I1-1; G1-3; C1-4; C3-1; C4-1
Net fishers and line fishers	1	C3-1
Line fishers and spear fishers	1	R3-1
Aquaculture and recreational fishers	1	R1-1
Commercial fishers and tourism	1	C3-1
Commercial fishers and rest of community	2	G1-1; CM1-1
Recreational net fishers and jet ski users	1	G1-1
Rock lobster fishers and scuba divers	1	C1-1
Native title claimants vs other groups	2	CM1-1; C3-1

The Jurien Bay marine reserve advisory committee provides the most appropriate forum for raising awareness and negotiating resolutions to all of these differences.

Conflict between commercial and recreational fishers was identified by several group representatives. Existing animosity was reported based on the issue of resource sharing, and the conflict between these two groups has the potential to become bitter. When conflicting parties feel strongly about an issue and also feel either under represented or isolated from the advisory committee negotiation forum, negotiated settlements by committee members may not quell conflict within the broader community. Under these circumstances, additional negotiations at the grass roots level within the community may be required if broad acceptance is to be achieved. A more detailed assessment of conflicts, to be undertaken in consultation with Fisheries WA, will assist in determining the most appropriate negotiation pathway. If there is to be any negotiation outside the advisory committee, every effort should be made to ensure that all those involved have a receptive attitude and have a high level of understanding of all of the assessment points summarised in the previous section of this report.

Community animosity over native title claims appears to be based largely on a fear that successful claimants would be granted right of veto. As this is not the case, the potential for conflict to develop further is low.

v) Incorrect rumours within the community

Three rumours were identified within the community;

- Black Point will be made a no-take area. (G1-1)
- Recreational fishing will be stopped within a 5 km radius of shore (CM5-1), or 5 nautical miles of shore (C1-1)
- CALM will take over the role of fisheries. (R3-1)

As none of these rumours appeared well entrenched no special action is considered necessary. It is expected that the next stage of the ppp will provide the accurate information necessary to dispel them.

CALM seeks the endorsement of the Jurien Bay advisory committee to proceed to the high profile stage of the public participation program IIa in accordance with findings in this report.

Appendix I CONTACT LIST

Community members

- | | |
|--|---|
| local residents & rate payers | - community leaders
- children, teenagers and adults
- individuals and community associations |
| aboriginal communities | - community leaders
- children, teenagers and adults
- individuals, community associations and governing bodies |
| vacation visitors | - children, teenagers and adults
- individuals and community associations |
| neighbouring land owners | - individuals and associations |
| broader community | - community leaders
- individuals and associations |

Recreational activity groups

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| boating | - individuals, retail outlets and associations |
| diving | - individuals, retail outlets and associations |
| fishing | - individuals, retail outlets and associations |
| nature study & collectors | - individuals and associations |
| 4 wheel driving | - individuals, retail outlets and associations |

Interest groups

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| conservationists | - individuals, local groups and broad interest associations |
| scientists | - individuals, research institutions and associations
- in the fields of coastal geomorphology, natural history, fisheries, oceanographic and cultural heritage research, social sciences, tourism research |
| educators | - local teachers plus education associations and governing bodies
- associated with pre-primary, primary, secondary, tertiary and vocational education |

Government

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| local | - Shire councillors and senior shire officers |
| state | - CALM staff
- regional officers and head office representatives within the Departments of Fisheries, Environmental Protection (DEP), Transport, Museum, Tourism Commission, Aboriginal Affairs, |

Mines and Energy, and where appropriate, Rottnest Island Authority, Police, Agriculture and others.

commonwealth

- local departmental officers and head office representatives within the departments of Environment Australia, Primary Industry, DEP, Aboriginal Affairs, Defence, Customs and others where appropriate.

parliament

- State Environment Minister and local member
- other elected members
- Commonwealth local member

Industry groups

fishing

- individuals, associations and governing bodies
- retail outlets

aquaculture

- individuals, associations and governing bodies
- retail outlets

tourism

- accommodation, hire companies, tour operators, tourist bureaus and tourist feature managers (e.g. Underwater World)
- individuals, associations and governing bodies

mining

- individual companies with interests in the area
- associations and governing bodies

agriculture

- individual companies with interests in the area
- associations and governing bodies

Reserve advisory committees

The press

- local, State wide, national

User Group

Contact

No. people

face to face	telephone	written
--------------	-----------	---------

Attitudes towards marine reserve proposal

	receptive	cautious	hostile
beginning of discussion			
end of discussion			

Level of knowledge & understanding adequate

	low	adequate	excellent
values of proposed area	←		→
marine reserve multiple-use & zoning	←		→
representativeness & no-take	←		→
sustainability	←		→
integrated management	←		→
planning process & public participation	←		→

Interviewer Date/...../.....

Questions / concerns / knowledge gaps.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Rumours

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Community conflicts

.....

Community alliances

.....

Notes to accompany discussion forms

User Group

refer to attached list for definition

Contact

name of individual / group / agency

No. people

Number of people involved in discussion minus the interviewees.

Face to face	telephone	written
--------------	-----------	---------

Tick the method of communication used.

Attitudes towards marine reserve proposal

Try to distinguish between attitudes towards the reserve proposal and attitudes towards the interviewees.

Level of knowledge and understanding

Ask open questions. Place a mark across the sliding scale which represents the level of knowledge and understanding prior to discussions.

Knowledge and understanding is adequate if the interviewee knows and comprehends;

Values of proposed area: At least three value attributes from the following list in relation to the proposed area;

commercial fishing	scientific
tourism	educational
recreation	scenic / amenity
wildlife	conservation

Multiple-use & zoning: WA marine reserves allow for many uses, both commercial and recreational.

Different activities are separated into geographically distinct areas.

WA marine reserve types and zoning options.

Representativeness & no-take: Diversity of ecosystem types around the State and the concept of samples of each being represented within a state wide reserve system.

Diversity of habitat types within reserve proposal area and the concept of samples of each being represented within no-take zones.

Reasons for no-take areas and issues of zone scales for the different reasons.

Sustainability: Primacy of conservation for sustainable use.

Cumulative impacts of multiple use.

Integrated management: Many agencies have management jurisdiction in the marine environment.

Marine reserves provide a management framework to coordinate the activities of all these agencies.

Planning process & public participation: Advisory committee has community based membership.

Advisory committee substantially develops the indicative management plan.

Public input into the initial stages of planning is primarily through Advisory committee members.

After the issuance of the draft management plan there is a statutory public submission period for written submissions direct to CALM.

Questions / concerns / knowledge gaps + community conflicts and alliances

Ask open questions.

Rumours

These will come out naturally during the discussion. There is no need to address this issue directly.

Appendix IV COMMUNICATION TECHNIQUES

Face to face

- discussions with individuals
- group discussions both informal and formal meetings
- drama/theatre

Printed material - letters

- brochures and leaflets
- posters
- stickers
- books
- signs
- displays, both static and interactive
- articles in;
 - magazines
 - journals
 - newspapers
 - newsletters

Electronic media

- telephone
- radio
- audio cassette
- television
- video
- Internet

Educational courses

- primary
- secondary
- tertiary
- vocational

Novelty items

Public consultation activities

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| - | |
| - public meeting | - information line |
| - open house | - targeting briefing |
| - workshop | - public seminar |
| - public discussion paper & call for submissions | - site visit |
| - advisory committee | - focus group session |