



Summary of Submissions on the Port Stephens-Great Lakes Marine Park Draft Zoning Plan

December 2006

Marine Parks Authority, Locked Bag 800, Nelson Bay NSW 2315

Table of Contents

<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	4
<u>1. INTRODUCTION</u>	6
<u>2. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PROCESS</u>	6
<u>3. PROCESS FOR SUBMISSIONS</u>	7
3.1 LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS.....	8
3.2 MAIN INTERESTS IN THE MARINE PARK.....	8
<u>4.0 OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON ZONES</u>	9
4.1 ALL ZONES IN MARINE PARK	9
4.2 ZONING COMMENTS BY LOCATION	10
4.2.1 CAPE HAWKE AND THE PINNACLE	10
4.2.2 SMITHS LAKE	10
4.2.3 SEAL ROCKS	11
4.2.4 SAWTOOTH ROCKS HABITAT PROTECTION ZONE	11
4.2.5 EDITH BREAKERS HABITAT PROTECTION ZONE	12
4.2.6 FIONA/YAGON BEACH	12
4.2.7 MYALL LAKE	12
4.2.8 BOOLAMBAYTE LAKE	13
4.2.9 BOMBAH BROADWATER AND NERONG CREEK	13
4.2.10 MYALL RIVER	13
4.2.11 BROUGHTON ISLAND	14
4.2.12 CABBAGE TREE ISLAND AND YACAABA HEAD	14
4.2.13 FINGAL ISLAND (I) AND FINGAL ISLAND (II)	15
4.2.14 FLY POINT – CORRIE ISLAND	16
4.2.15 JIMMYS BEACH	16
4.2.16 FAME COVE	16
4.2.17 NORTH ARM COVE	17
4.2.18 NUMBER ONE COVE (YALIMBAH)	17
4.2.19 KARUAH RIVER	17
4.2.20 LITTLE SWAN BAY	17
4.2.21 BIG SWAN BAY (TWELVE MILE CREEK)	18
4.2.22 MALLABULLA	18
4.2.23 WALLIS AND FENNINGHAM ISLAND CREEKS	18
4.2.24 CROMARTYS BAY	18
4.2.25 SALAMANDER BAY	19
<u>5.0 COMMENTS ON THE MARINE PARKS AMENDMENT (PORT STEPHENS-GREAT LAKES MARINE PARK) DRAFT REGULATION 2006</u>	19
5.1 DOMESTIC ANIMALS.....	19
5.2 MOTORISED WHEELED VEHICLES.....	20
5.3 FISH CLEANING	20
5.4 ANCHORING	20
5.5 SPEED RESTRICTIONS IN SANCTUARY ZONES	20

5.6. PERMITTED FISHING ACTIVITIES.....	21
5.7. PROHIBITED FISHING ACTIVITIES AND PROTECTION OF SPECIES.....	21
5.8 FISHING METHOD RESTRICTIONS IN HABITAT PROTECTION ZONES	21
5.9 COLLECTING	21
5.10 FISHING CLOSURES.....	22
5.11 AQUACULTURE	22
5.12 SPECIAL PURPOSE ZONES.....	22
5.13 SETLINING/DROP LINING	22
5.14 HOVERCRAFTS AND AIRBOATS.....	23
5.15 MOTORISED WATER-SPORTS AND PERSONAL WATERCRAFT.....	23

6.0 GENERAL COMMENTS FROM SUBMISSIONS..... 23

6.1 COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	23
6.1.1 COMMERCIAL FISHING.....	23
6.1.2 BUYBACK.....	24
6.1.3 AQUACULTURE	24
6.1.4 COMMERCIAL DOLPHIN WATCHING	24
6.1.5 COMMERCIAL OPERATORS	24
6.1.6 TOURISM AND LOCAL ECONOMY	24
6.2 MANAGEMENT.....	25
6.2.1 MONITORING AND SCIENTIFIC DATA.....	25
6.2.2 CONSULTATION PROCESS.....	25
6.2.3 MINISTERIAL DISCRETION	25
6.2.4 PUBLIC EDUCATION	25
6.2.5 SIGNAGE AND IDENTIFICATION OF ZONE BOUNDARIES	25
6.2.6 ANCHORING.....	26
6.3 RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES.....	26
6.3.1 RECREATIONAL FISHING.....	26
6.3.2 SPEARFISHING	26
6.3.3 4WD ACCESS	27
6.3.4 DIVING	27
6.3.5 MOTORISED WATER-SPORTS	27
6.4 BIODIVERSITY PROTECTION	27
6.4.1 CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY PROTECTION	27
6.4.2 GREY NURSE SHARK PROTECTION	28
6.4.3 POLLUTION	28
6.5 ZONING	29
6.5.1 SANCTUARY ZONES.....	29
6.5.2 WALLIS LAKE.....	29

APPENDIX 1 – ORGANISATIONS THAT COMMENTED ON THE DRAFT ZONING PLAN

30

APPENDIX 2 – PETITIONS

31

Executive Summary

On 5 December 2005 the Port Stephens-Great Lakes Marine Park was declared.

On 8 May 2006 the Minister for Primary Industries released the Port Stephens-Great Lakes Marine Park Draft Zoning Plan for public comment. The submission period closed on 23 September 2006.

During the time from the release of the draft zoning plan to the submission period closing, extensive community consultation took place. Marine Parks Authority staff attended 75 meetings with individuals and stakeholder groups which included presentations, focus group workshops and community information sessions.

A total of 4,399 submissions were received from a wide range of interest groups: 4,347 from individuals, families and businesses, and 52 on behalf of organisations.

Submission formats varied and included individual and group submissions, letters, e-mails, form letters, alternative questionnaires, maps, reports and the Port Stephens-Great Lakes Marine Park submission forms contained within the draft zoning plan or on the Marine Parks Authority website. The Marine Parks Authority did not give any particular weighting to the various submission types and has reviewed and considered all submissions.

The majority of submissions, 50%, were received from within the local marine park area with 35% received from other areas in NSW and 7% from other states and overseas (8% did not provide a post code).

1203 submissions referred to an alternative zoning map prepared by conservation organisations, which agreed with the draft zoning plan and requested extensions and additions to these sanctuary zones.

The majority of comments on the zones referred to Broughton Island, Seal Rocks, Cabbage Tree Island, Fingal Island (both zones), Edith Breakers and Little Swan Bay. The main comments expressed a dichotomy of viewpoints to either expand zones for enhanced conservation outcomes or decrease zones to allow more recreational fishing access. Frequent comments made in reference to the draft zoning plan include the following:

- that the sanctuary zones should be larger to incorporate more habitat, better representative examples of habitat, and to promote zone linkages;
- recreational fishers should have more fishing access and have little impact on marine biodiversity;
- disagreement with the concept of sanctuary zones;
- “one out all out” – all users groups/activities should be excluded from sanctuary zones;
- spearfishers have requested access to pelagic species in sanctuary zones as spearfishing has minimal impact on marine biodiversity and no impact on the grey nurse shark;
- that commercial fishing should be significantly reduced, in particular netting should be banned or greatly restricted;
- that divers should not be permitted in grey nurse shark critical habitats or areas of sensitive habitat;
- perceived negative economic impacts of the marine park;
- the demarcation of zone boundaries so that zones can be easily identified especially without the use of a GPS;

- a number of comments were made in regards to Wallis Lake including that it needs protection; it should have been included in the marine park; it should be made a recreational fishing haven.

The activities from the draft regulation that received the most responses were:

- (1) anchoring = 1,987
- (2) permitted fishing activities = 1,655
- (3) prohibited fishing activities and protection of species = 1,641
- (4) fishing closures = 1,639
- (5) fish cleaning = 1,615

Respondents identified their main interests in the marine park as the following:

- (1) recreational fishing = 2,282
- (2) conservation = 2,010
- (3) spearfishing = 842
- (4) scuba diving = 487
- (5) personal water craft/motorised water-sports = 262
- (6) commercial fishing = 126
- (7) charter fishing = 114
- (8) aquaculture = 95
- (9) other = 474

Note: the sum of interests exceeds the total of submissions received overall due to individual's capacity to identify multiple interests.

This Summary of Submissions reports on the comments made in the written submissions but does not provide an interpretation or evaluation. The Marine Parks Authority carefully considers all submissions as well as discussions and advice received at various meetings and venues throughout the consultation program.

The Marine Parks Authority has attempted to consider all issues in such a way as to balance social and economic issues with the biodiversity conservation goals required under the *Marine Parks Act 1997*.

1. Introduction

This report is a summary of the submissions received on the Port Stephens-Great Lakes Marine Park Draft Zoning Plan and Regulation. The draft zoning plan and Regulation were released for a period of four months for public comment.

This summary provides an overview of submissions and does not fully report the detailed information presented in many submissions. It is for this reason that individual comments may not be reported “word for word”, but rather are aggregated with similar comments or issues. It is not uncommon for specific interest groups to generate large volumes of submissions on one particular issue. The Marine Parks Authority recognises that this may not necessarily reflect the level of interest in the community generally but may be due to other factors such as: there may only be a limited number of people involved in a specific activity; some groups are more organised in encouraging submissions from their constituents than others; the time and resources available to different groups to respond; lack of understanding or assumption that specific groups or communities will or will not be affected. Submissions are summarised on the information and ideas expressed irrespective of the “type” of submission.

This summary does not attempt to analyse, interpret or weight submissions or issues. It is important to note that submissions received are generally from groups of individuals that have an interest in the marine park or feel they may be affected by proposed management options. This summary does not represent or assume the view of the broader community in its entirety.

2. Community Consultation Process

The Marine Parks Authority (MPA), which is established under the *Marine Parks Act 1997* (the Act), seeks to engage and involve the community in marine parks. Local support is important for successful park management. In particular, the Authority aims to achieve biodiversity conservation objectives prescribed by the *Marine Parks Act 1997*, whilst providing for sustainable uses, and minimising potential social and economic impacts.

To achieve a balance between biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, the Authority undertakes a program of extensive community consultation during the preparation of a zoning plan, over and above that required by regulatory requirements. This process began prior to the declaration of the Port Stephens-Great Lakes Marine Park (PSGLMP) and will continue (albeit at a lower scale) throughout the life of the Marine Park. The process has followed the legislative requirements as outlined in Section 16 of the Act.

Consultation was conducted in two stages. The first stage occurred immediately after marine park declaration in December 2005, and the second stage commenced on the release of the Draft Zoning Plan in May 2006.

Initial meetings with stakeholder groups and the MPA were held in December 2005 to introduce the Marine Park, the planning process, and associated timeframe. Stakeholder groups addressed included government departments and local government, commercial fishers, recreational fishers, tourism and commercial operators, Department of Defence, and conservation groups. An awareness brochure on the Port Stephens-Great Lakes Marine Park was distributed at these meetings.

Approximately 50,000 community and visitor surveys were distributed via inserts in all local newspapers within the vicinity of the marine park and direct mail-out to fishing clubs, conservation groups, local Aboriginal land councils, and government agencies. These surveys, as well as the colour brochure, were made available at all Tourism Visitor Centres, Fisheries, National Parks and Maritime offices, Port Stephens and Great Lakes Council

Chambers, and additional locations on request (such as bait and tackle shops, caravan parks and libraries). All documents were available to download from the NSW MPA website www.mpa.nsw.gov.au.

Specialised surveys were mailed directly to all commercial fishers holding endorsements to fish within the area of the marine park, and to all listed commercial operators in the region. Information sessions and stakeholder focus group meetings were conducted during this initial phase, as well as presentations to a variety of community groups to raise awareness of the marine park planning process. A total of 62 meetings, presentations, focus groups and information sessions were conducted during this period.

The primary aim of this initial survey period was to identify the current uses of the marine park by a variety of stakeholder groups, and assess the values placed on the marine and estuarine environment by those groups. Use information also assisted with draft zone placement. The initial survey period provided planners and managers with valuable information to assist with zoning the Marine Park.

The initial consultation phase provided a substantial amount of data on activities within the Marine Park. This information was mapped using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and provided the Marine Park team with a series of maps detailing where fishing and commercial activities took place in the park. This information was presented to the local advisory committee, and, in conjunction with the detailed information on habitats within the Marine Park, assisted with preparation of the draft zoning plan.

The draft zoning plan submission brochure was released on 8 May 2006 with public notices for the release issued the following week. The draft Regulation (legal version of the draft zoning plan) was released on 23 June 2006; therefore the public submission period was extended to finish three months from its release. 43,000 copies of the draft zoning plan brochure (containing the submission form) were distributed to an extensive list of locations including DPI, DEC and Maritime offices, Council offices, regional libraries, all regional Visitor Information Centres, bait and tackle outlets, dive shops, fishing clubs, caravan parks and general stores. Feedback received from the general public is that the majority of residents have viewed the draft zoning plan at some stage.

Various mechanisms have been used to advise the public about open meetings, to draw attention to the public exhibition of the draft zoning plan and to encourage public submission on the plan. These have included media releases, advertising, public display of the draft zoning plan and distribution of draft zoning plans.

During the consultation period on the draft zoning plan, a total of 75 meetings were held (including information sessions, open public meetings, focus group meetings and presentations). Many community groups and clubs requested presentations on the draft zoning plan. The consultation schedule was expanded to incorporate these events. Requests came from fishing clubs, professional groups, environment organisations, and local community precincts.

3. Process for Submissions

Submissions were received by fax, email, post and at focus groups and community information sessions. Formats varied and included individual and group submissions (some with member lists attached) letters, e-mails, form letters and photocopied submissions (identical submissions except for name and address), alternative questionnaires, maps, reports and the Port Stephens–Great Lakes Marine Park submission forms contained within the draft zoning plan or via the MPA website. The Marine Parks Authority did not give any particular weighting to the various submission types and has reviewed and considered all submissions. All submissions were considered according to their content irrespective of the “type” of submission.

All submissions were date stamped upon receipt and locked in a filing cabinet until processing. Details of the individual or group making the submission were recorded in a customised Microsoft Access database and allocated a unique record number to allow for easy identification and subsequent data retrieval.

Each submission was reviewed to determine specific zones, particular locations within the zones, the main reason(s) for agreement or disagreement with these zones and any key themes or issues relating to the draft zoning plan. Submissions were also reviewed for map information as many people had drawn on the map to offer zone suggestions and/or alterations. Much of this information was mapped into a spatial GIS layer to assist with analysis and also entered into the database with comments recorded against the relevant zones.

Many duplicate submissions were received from individuals, which were then compared to the original submissions and new information added to the original in the database. This facilitated people with new ideas or comments to provide further information on the draft zoning plan. Duplicate submissions from the same individual/organisation were only counted as one submission and recorded with the one unique record number.

3.1 Location of Respondents

4399 submissions were received within the specified timeframe and entered in the PSGMLP submission database. The locations of respondents are summarised in the table below.

Region	Number of responses	% of total returns
Marine Park Area	2216	50
Central Coast to Swansea	199	4.5
Sydney Metropolitan	787	18
NSW (all other areas)	531	12
Other States	285	6.5
Overseas	19	.5
No post code given	362	8

The *Marine Park area* includes postcodes within the immediate vicinity of the park and extends to the areas encompassing Newcastle, Maitland, Singleton and Taree.

3.2 Main Interests in the Marine Park

Respondents identified their main interests in the Marine Park as the following:

- (1) recreational fishing = 2282
- (2) conservation = 2010
- (3) spearfishing = 842
- (4) scuba diving = 487
- (5) personal water craft/motorised water-sports = 262
- (6) commercial fishing = 126
- (7) charter fishing = 114
- (8) aquaculture = 95
- (9) other = 474

Note that the sum of interest groups exceeds the total of submissions received overall due to an individual's capacity to identify with multiple interests.

4.0 Overview and Summary of Comments on Zones

The zones that received the majority of comments were Broughton Island, Seal Rocks, Cabbage Tree Island, Fingal Island (both zones), Edith Breakers and Little Swan Bay. The main comments expressed a dichotomy of viewpoints to either expand zones for enhanced conservation values or decrease zones to allow more recreational fishing access.

1203 submissions referred to an alternative zoning map prepared by conservation organisations, which agreed with the draft zoning plan and requested extensions and additions to these sanctuary zones. The database reflects these submissions as *'Disagree – Extend for conservation'* to enable the MPA to easily identify where changes have been requested.

Reasons for agreement or disagreement with zones have been classified into groups with similar meanings as follows:

Reason	Description
Agree with zoning	Agree with proposed zoning
Extend for conservation	Zone should be larger for enhanced conservation values
Ban commercial fishing	Commercial fishing should be banned in the area of the zone instead of restricting recreational access
Impact on commercial fishing	The zone will have an adverse impact on commercial fishing
General comments	<p>General comments for disagreement with a zone may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good recreational fishing area; • Good spearfishing area; • Motorised water sports area (eg. jet skiing, waterskiing); • Zone is too big/restrictive; • There will be a negative impact on tourism/local economy; • There is a lack of scientific data; • There is a lack consultation; • The park/zoning is based on political motivation; • Current activities should continue; • No reason given (disagreement with zone with no comment provided).

4.1 All Zones in Marine Park

Many submissions did not comment on individual zones and instead expressed agreement or disagreement with the entire zoning plan. **These numbers are not included in the individual zones counts.**

Issues and comments in regards to “All Zones”

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with All Marine Park Zones	96
Disagree	Extend for conservation	64
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	9
Disagree	General comments	64

4.2 Zoning Comments by Location

4.2.1 Cape Hawke and The Pinnacle

- Popular area for boat based fishers wanting a short trip out of Forster.
- Some commercial fishers want access around The Pinnacle itself (with a 500m buffer) to jig for bonito and kingfish and instead extend the zone eastward.
- Existing grey nurse shark (GNS) critical habitat zone with restrictions is adequate, so no need for a sanctuary zone.
- Sanctuary zone (SZ) is too large.
- Sanctuary zone needs to be larger to incorporate Latitude Rock as it is an important GNS site.
- SZ is truncated along the coastline which reduces protection of habitat; would be beneficial to have SZ extend from the shore to the 3 nautical mile limit to ensure across shelf continuity and facilitates compliance.
- Need to ensure the southern boundary has an adequate distance from the Janies Corner sewage outfall (Midcoast Water).
- Current southern boundary impacts commercial bonito fishing and lobster gathering.
- Habitat protection zone (HPZ) at Cape Hawke impacts purse seine bait fishing.
- A high priority area for the abalone fishery – request for special purpose zone to allow commercial access to abalone along the shore.
- Latitude Rock area is a popular spot for spearfishers and recreational fishers.
- Land based game fishing area on ledges of Cape Hawke.
- Experienced spearfishers spear in deep water around the pinnacles for pelagic species.
- Spearfishers request access along coast (HPZ out to 500m from coast).
- Trolling for migratory pelagic fish species has no impact on the biodiversity of the sanctuary zone and should be allowed to continue.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	25
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1300
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	10
Disagree	General comments	917

4.2.2 Smiths Lake

- Sanctuary zone restricts fishing more than is acceptable to many in the local community.
- Impacts residences on the zone perimeter particularly Tarbuck Bay
- Existing general use and habitat protection zones are inadequate to support commercial fishers.
- Current commercial fishing is sustainable.
- University of NSW field station concerned that zoning will impact its research and educational activities.
- Sanctuary zone should be increased as Smiths Lake is the only ICOLL (intermittently closing and opening lake or lagoon) in the region.
- Commercial fishing should be banned in the lake and allow recreational fishing only.
- Popular area for motorised water-sports.
- There will be a transfer of fishing effort and motorised water-sport activities to the habitat protection zone.
- Allow commercial fishing to continue until licences expire then buyback licences.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	33
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1299
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	10
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	27
Disagree	General comments	393

4.2.3 Seal Rocks

- Size of sanctuary zone significantly limits boat-based fishing as only small boats can launch from Boat Beach and will have to travel much further to fish.
- Shore-based fishers catered for.
- Impact on trap and line fishery.
- Trawl area north and south of Seal Rocks SZ.
- Recreational and commercial fishers want to continue fishing at Big and Little Seal Rocks as many feel existing restrictions for GNS are adequate.
- Allow locals to commercially fish the area.
- Commercial trap and line fishers want 60m and deeper left open for lobster trapping.
- The Seal Rocks area is a difficult area to fish from boats given launching conditions are often adverse, hence there is some natural protection and the area is unlikely to be over-fished.
- SZ needs to be larger and incorporate Edith Breakers and Sawtooth Rocks.
- Spearfishers want access to Skeleton Rocks for pelagic species (deep water and few spearfishers use area) as well as access to spear 500m around Sawtooth Rocks, Big and Little Seal Rocks; spearfishers comment that they have no impact on grey nurse shark and that spearing is highly selective.
- Belmona Reef is one of few offshore reefs available to spearfishers.
- Some recreational and commercial fishers would prefer the SZ to be moved south past the Big Gibber along Mungo Beach area.
- Commercial trawlers should be banned in Seal Rocks area within the 3nm limit to protect sponge and coral.
- Traditional beach hauling (no jetboats) on allocated beaches and only local commercial fishers to be permitted to use area.
- Lack of scientific data to support grey nurse shark decline or threats.
- Divers should not be permitted in grey nurse shark critical habitat areas.
- Trolling for migratory pelagic fish species has no impact on the biodiversity of the sanctuary zone and should be allowed to continue.
- 1km coastal corridor necessary between Edith Breakers and Skeleton Rocks to accommodate small boat anglers.
- Has some impact on commercial abalone fishery.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	30
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1296
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	10
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	2
Disagree	General comments	1273

4.2.4 Sawtooth Rocks Habitat Protection Zone

- Recommendation to extend Sawtooth Rocks habitat protection zone to include the whole of Sawtooth Rocks for ease of compliance and for more fishing access.
- Gear restrictions are not adequate protection for the grey nurse shark – should be full SZ.
- Requests to use bait for land based rock fishers especially around rock pools.

- Plastic lures can be just as effective as bait, so bait fishing should be permitted.
- Divers should be banned in GNS critical habitats.
- Anchoring is necessary for safety for recreational activities.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	13
Disagree	Extend for conservation	7
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	1
Disagree	General comments	795

Note: the majority of conservation submissions on Seal Rocks SZ call for an extension of SZ which includes Sawtooth Rocks.

4.2.5 Edith Breakers Habitat Protection Zone

- Current grey nurse shark restrictions at Edith Breakers are sufficient.
- Should be full SZ for grey nurse shark as gear restrictions are inadequate.
- Divers should be banned in GNS critical habitats.
- Spearfishers request anchoring at Edith Breakers for access to Treachery Reef.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	113
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1287
Disagree	General comments	652

4.2.6 Fiona/Yagon Beach

- Entire beach is important to commercial pipi and beach-worm gatherers and suggestions to move sanctuary zone from Little Gibber to Mungo Track or divide SZ into four separate zones - a 1km SZ on Fiona Beach and three 1km SZs south along Mungo Beach area.
- Impact on commercial beach hauling.
- Recreational fishers would like the beach to be a HPZ in the event the beach is re-opened to 4WDs by National Parks (some submissions request the Rutile Road be re-opened).

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	118
Disagree	Extend for conservation	5
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	2
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	24
Disagree	General comments	91

4.2.7 Myall Lake

- Too large an area in SZ.
- Unworkable area left for commercial fishers and zone options proposed.
- Impacts a water skiing area near Long Point and Kataway Hill.
- Commercial fishing should be banned in the Myall Lake.
- The Myall Lakes should be entirely habitat protection zones instead of sanctuary and general use zones.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	22
Disagree	Extend for conservation	14
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	6
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	26
Disagree	General comments	344

4.2.8 Boolambayte Lake

- Primary recreational concern is waterskiing.
- Some impact on recreational fishing.
- The Myall Lakes should be entirely habitat protection zones instead of sanctuary and general use zones.
- SZ should be extended on both sides of lake and remaining area should be HPZ.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	11
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1300
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	4
Disagree	General comments	107

4.2.9 Bombah Broadwater and Nerong Creek

- The current SZ impacts commercial meshing.
- Allow commercial mesh netting with minimum mesh of 95mm.
- Allow seasonal meshing in Nerong Creek.
- Bombah Point SZ adversely impacts users of the adjacent recreational campground.
- Relocate SZ to Nerong Inlet and the mouth of Myall River across to where Broadwater meets the Myall River to protect spawning bass.
- Ban commercial fishing in Nerong Creek.
- The Myall Lakes should be entirely habitat protection zones instead of sanctuary and general use zones.
- Special purpose zone (SPZ) requested for Nerong Harbour/drainage reserve for maintenance purposes.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	14
Disagree	Extend for conservation	5
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	5
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	5
Disagree	General comments	193

4.2.10 Myall River

- Sanctuary zone should be extended south past Dredge Island.
- Increase SZ to protect seagrass, mangroves and prawn stocks.
- SZ should be HPZ instead.
- The entire Myall River should be habitat protection zone.
- Impacts commercial prawn shots.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	13
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1305
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	4
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	1
Disagree	General comments	67

4.2.11 Broughton Island

- Area of HPZ needs to be extended to include some key recreational fishing sites
- Modification of northern boundary requested to facilitate compliance and leave an important recreational fishing beach open.
- SZ has impacts on charter fishing.
- Sanctuary zone should be larger with only Esmeralda Cove as a HPZ as gear restrictions are not adequate protection for grey nurse shark.
- Entire island should be in SZ.
- Recreational fishers and spearfishers have no impact on grey nurse shark so no need for a HPZ with gear and anchoring restrictions.
- Minor boundary modification proposed by recreational fishers for southern tip of Little Broughton Island to be included in the HPZ with gear restrictions.
- Need to retain recreational fishing areas on the north side of island which have easy pedestrian access.
- North east area of SZ impacts commercial calamari fishery.
- Gamefishers request seasonal surface trolling for pelagics as trolling has no impact on grey nurse shark.
- Spearfishers want access to north side of island and western boundary by Looking Glass Isle (Cod Rock) as this is an important area for beginner and intermediate spearfishers, plus northeast corner for pelagic fish.
- No gear or anchoring restrictions as it impacts an important bonito area; bonito are surface fish and an important source of bait for recreational fishers.
- Southern shore of Broughton Island is one of high priority areas to the abalone fishery – request for special purpose zone to allow commercial access.
- Anchoring is necessary for safety for recreational activities.
- Ensure adequate system of moorings at Broughton.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	36
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1308
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	4
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	5
Disagree	General comments	1296

4.2.12 Cabbage Tree Island and Yacaaba Head

- Boundary modifications proposed to extend HPZ for bait fishing to southern point of island and to make boundaries of SZ more regular and easier to comply with.
- SZ needs to be expanded to effectively protect Goulds petrel and the little penguin.
- SZ should be expanded to include Little Island and Boondelbah Island.
- Include squid as a permitted species for bait collecting.
- Request from scuba divers/snorklers to have a SZ (with no anchoring) edging the western side of the island to protect the strip of reef, with the bait fishing zone commencing 50 to 100m offshore.
- Current HPZ for bait fishing contains 2 Little Penguin rafting sites - only one rafting site protected by the SZ.

- Current SZ impacts charter fishing trolling ground where Yacaaba Headland goes across to Cabbage Tree Island.
- Gamefishers request a strip for bait fishing around the entire Cabbage Tree Island.
- Spearfishers request access to spearfish in the bait fishing HPZ.
- Rock fishers request HPZ along Yacaaba Head for fishing access;
- Yacaaba Head is safe place for rock fishers in a southerly swell.
- Spearfishers request access to SE section of Yacaaba.
- Complaints about longliners taking all the bait; objections to commercial bait collection at recreational sites.
- SZ at Yacaaba Head impacts lobster area – concern that commercial rock lobster activity will move to recreational fishing areas; no other accessible lobster areas for recreational fishers.
- Allow recreational fishers to have non-bait species in their possession.
- Cabbage Tree SZ will result in transfer of effort to Little and Boondelbah Islands.
- Eastern shore of Yacaaba Head and Cabbage Tree Island are high priority areas to the abalone fishery – request for special purpose zone to allow commercial access.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	20
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1298
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	2
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	8
Disagree	General comments	1164

4.2.13 Fingal Island (i) and Fingal Island (ii)

- Two split sanctuary zones will negate future monitoring measures and be difficult to enforce.
- Ideal area for small boats as safe fishing area just outside heads.
- Have only one side of the island or the other in SZ – not both.
- Both zones should be joined to make a single larger SZ to be more effective.
- Requests to move one of the Fingal zones south along Anna Bay or Boat Harbour area.
- Spearfishers want access around Shark Island and Shark Bay.
- Fingal Island (i) is sheltered in western winds for both rock and beach and offshore fishers.
- Some commercial fishers want no sanctuary zone on the north of Fingal and instead extend the zone on the south side.
- Impact on rock lobster fishing.
- Trolling for migratory species off Box Beach has no impact on biodiversity and should be allowed to continue.
- Southern shore of Fingal is a high priority area to the abalone fishery – request for special purpose zone to allow commercial access.

Fingal Island (i – north)

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	20
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1306
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	6
Disagree	General comments	791

Fingal Island (ii – south)

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	14
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1297
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	2
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	3
Disagree	General comments	634

4.2.14 Fly Point – Corrie Island

- Retain existing aquatic reserve rules of fishing on the 2 jetties and along the beach between the jetties as Little Beach is a popular fishing spot, especially for children
- Little Beach has disabled access ramp on jetty so important to retain fishing access
- Commercial fishers are impacted by Corrie Island as it is a blue swimmer and mud crab fishery area.
- Corrie Island is a popular recreational fishing area.
- 4 knot speed limited area will be too difficult to comply with as it is too slow for most vessels – suggestions for a 8 knot speed limit.
- Speed restricted area should be larger to offer dolphins more protection.
- There should be an extension of sanctuary or addition of habitat protection zone to Pindimar.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	27
Disagree	Extend for conservation	20
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	2
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	2
Disagree	General comments	730

4.2.15 Jimmys Beach

- SZ not large enough to be effective.
- Commercial netting should be banned at Jimmys Beach.
- Entire beach area should be HPZ.
- Speed restriction area for dolphins should be larger.
- Barnes Rocks is popular recreational fishing area so important to exclude from SZ.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	19
Disagree	Extend for conservation	25
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	10
Disagree	General comments	21

4.2.16 Fame Cove

- Popular safe mooring/anchorage area for travelling boats – zone should not include moorings.
- Zone should be bigger to offer protection to turtles.
- Fame Cove HPZ to Soldiers Point HPZ is an important commercial meshing area.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	9
Disagree	Extend for conservation	10
Disagree	General comments	22

4.2.17 North Arm Cove

- Residents want to retain fishing in the channel of Bundabah Creek as safe place to fish in windy conditions – support creek to be HPZ with restrictions on commercial netting and with 4 knot speed limit to protect turtles.
- SZ should include entire cove.
- General use area of cove should be habitat protection zone.
- Bulga and Bundabah Creeks impact on commercial mud crabbing and meshing.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	16
Disagree	Extend for conservation	11
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	1
Disagree	General comments	61

4.2.18 Number One Cove (Yalimbah)

- Impact on residences on Yalimbah Creek.
- Impact on commercial crab trapping – requests to move SZ further up mouth of cove
- SZ should be expanded to meet with Little Swan Bay SZ and incorporate Wurrung and Snapper Islands.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	12
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1285
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	4
Disagree	General comments	36

4.2.19 Karuah River

- Impacts on residences in Allworth – would prefer HPZ.
- SZ should be larger.
- The Branch River should be included as a SZ.
- Commercial fishers request meshing be permitted in HPZ up to the new bridge in Karuah.
- Commercial requests to have general use area up to the Branch River and instead to make the top Branch River a SZ.
- Commercial fishing should be banned as important bass breeding area.
- SZ should be larger to include areas of salt marsh, an endangered habitat, along Karuah River.
- Limeburners Creek should be a SZ.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	9
Disagree	Extend for conservation	23
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	1
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	8
Disagree	General comments	27

4.2.20 Little Swan Bay

- Impact on commercial crab trapping in Reedy Creek.
- Impact on commercial meshing.

- Support for increasing size of this SZ and linking with Number One Cove SZ to incorporate Wurrung and Snapper Islands.
- Recreational fishers and boaters want the area in channel open between Swan and Wurrung Islands as it is protected from winds and an ideal area for small boats to anchor and fish.
- Impacts local residences.
- Important area for aquaculture and requests for special purpose zones to accommodate activities.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	23
Disagree	Extend for conservation	1287
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	4
Disagree	General comments	459

4.2.21 Big Swan Bay (Twelve Mile Creek)

- Request for Twelve Mile Creek to be open for commercial mud crabbing.
- Special purpose zone necessary at Oyster Cove for the marina.
- Aquaculture facilities concerned with zoning in Oyster Cove and request special purpose zone as area is zoned for industrial use.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	8
Disagree	Extend for conservation	6
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	4
Disagree	General comments	9

4.2.22 Mallabulla

- Impacts local residences.
- Impact on commercial hauling – suggestion to move SZ west 500m.
- SZ should be extended.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	20
Disagree	Extend for conservation	5
Disagree	General comments	36

4.2.23 Wallis and Fenningham Island Creeks

- Impact on recreational and commercial crab trapping.
- SZ should be moved back 200m by Taylors Beach to allow crab trapping.
- Impacts charter fishing business.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	9
Disagree	Extend for conservation	3
Disagree	Impact on commercial fishing	4
Disagree	General comments	16

4.2.24 Cromartys Bay

- Requests for special purpose zone for aquaculture activities.
- Impact on charter fishing business.

- Extend SZ to western side of peninsula to protect seagrass area.
- Mud crabbing area.
- Popular area for watersport activities (jetskiing and waterskiing).

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	13
Disagree	Extend for conservation	3
Disagree	General comments	81

4.2.25 Salamander Bay

- Impacts local residences.
- Zone is too close to moorings.
- SZ should be in front of Mambo Creek Wetland instead of current proposal.
- Entire bay should be HPZ.
- SZ should be too small to be effective – should be larger to offer protection for seagrass, mangroves and migratory wading birds.
- Popular yabby pumping area.

Agree/Disagree	Reason	Count
Agree	Agree with zoning	7
Disagree	Extend for conservation	20
Disagree	Ban commercial fishing	1
Disagree	General comments	73

5.0 Comments on the *Marine Parks Amendment (Port Stephens-Great Lakes Marine Park) Draft Regulation 2006*

The Draft Amendment Regulation put forward a number of proposed regulations to control specific activities in conjunction with the zoning.

Comments on individual regulations have been summarised into categories in the tables below.

5.1 Domestic animals

COMMENT	Count
Allow if under control/on lead; must be more restricted; permit in designated areas only; droppings are a problem	151
Keep current restrictions; part of family lifestyle	212
No dogs in marine park or on beaches; danger to native fauna	105
Agree – no comment provided	953
Disagree – no comment provided	170
Total Responses	1591

5.2 Motorised wheeled vehicles

COMMENT	Count
Ban/authorised vehicles only; dangerous; damages dunes and habitat	67
Must be controlled/more restricted	75
Keep current areas/regulations; necessary for elderly/disabled; have no negative impact	200
More access needed	54
Agree – no comment provided	949
Disagree – no comment provided	219
Total Responses	1564

5.3 Fish cleaning

COMMENT	Count
Has no negative impact; provides food for marine fauna; is biodegradable; no need to change	431
More cleaning facilities/designated areas necessary	57
Causes pollution	18
No exceptions for commercial fishers	18
Agree – no comment provided	764
Disagree – no comment provided	327
Total Responses	1615

5.4 Anchoring

COMMENT	Count
Necessary in emergencies and for safety	132
Has no negative impact; no need to change	120
No anchoring in sensitive areas; damages habitat; permit in designated areas only	67
No anchoring in sanctuary zones	19
Public moorings necessary	353
No anchoring to be permitted for divers in SZs	15
Agree – no comment provided	728
Disagree – no comment provided	553
Total Responses	1987

5.5 Speed restrictions in sanctuary zones

COMMENT	Count
Speed has no negative impact; no restrictions necessary; no need to change	121
4 knots is too slow for a transit area	98
Necessary for safety; protects marine fauna	66
Restrictions are necessary in all sanctuary zones	13
Ban boats in these areas	7
Agree – no comment provided	973
Disagree – no comment provided	309
Total Responses	1587

5.6. Permitted fishing activities

COMMENT	Count
Disagree with sanctuary zone(s)	173
No recreational fishing restrictions	145
Existing regulations are sufficient; no need to change	119
Ban commercial fishing	80
Ban commercial netting	76
Ban beach hauling	21
Ban commercial fishing in enclosed waters	13
More restrictions and enforcement necessary	40
Agree – no comment provided	660
Disagree – no comment provided	328
Total Responses	1655

5.7. Prohibited fishing activities and protection of species

COMMENT	Count
Existing regulations are sufficient; no need to change	147
Scientific data necessary to support any restriction	70
No recreational fishing restrictions; recreational fishing has no impact	57
Will protect fish stocks/marine biodiversity	25
More restrictions and enforcement necessary	21
Ban commercial fishing	20
Agree – no comment provided	935
Disagree – no comment provided	356
Total Responses	1641

5.8 Fishing method restrictions in habitat protection zones

COMMENT	Count
Scientific data necessary to support restrictions	171
No recreational fishing restrictions; recreational fishing has no impact; existing regulations are sufficient	226
More restrictions necessary	29
Protects fish stocks/biodiversity	17
Ban commercial netting	15
Ban commercial fishing	13
Ban beach hauling	10
Agree – no comment provided	511
Disagree – no comment provided	597
Total Responses	1589

5.9 Collecting

COMMENT	Count
Current bag limits and restrictions are sufficient; no need to change	169
Allow recreational (non-commercial) collecting	29
No collecting in marine park area	20
Allow bait collection	18
Allow collection of shells/driftwood	12
Allow for scientific research; allow in designated areas	12
Agree – no comment provided	625
Disagree – no comment provided	684
Total Responses	1569

5.10 Fishing Closures

COMMENT	Count
Seasonal closures are necessary/protects breeding stocks	44
No recreational restrictions; recreational fishing has no impact; current bag limits are adequate	56
No need to change	88
Scientific data necessary to support closures	18
Disagree with sanctuary zone(s)	34
Agree – no comment provided	760
Disagree – no comment provided	639
Total Responses	1639

5.11 Aquaculture

COMMENT	Count
Support aquaculture; allow to continue with restrictions and environmental monitoring; provides food/stocks	126
Derelict leases are problem; aquaculture causes pollution	22
No need to change	92
No pearl farming to be permitted in marine park	63
Agree – no comment provided	972
Disagree – no comment provided	263
Total Responses	1538

5.12 Special purpose zones

COMMENT	Count
Necessary for certain activities	19
Need supervision and regulation	15
Not necessary	91
No pearl farming to be permitted in marine park	39
Agree – no comment provided	971
Disagree – no comment provided	360
Total Responses	1495

5.13 Setlining/drop lining

COMMENT	Count
Ban; injures wildlife; takes too many fish	127
Has no negative impact; no need to change	65
Allow for commercial fishers	7
Agree - no comment provided	915
Disagree - no comment provided	448
Total Responses	1562

5.14 Hovercrafts and airboats

COMMENT	Count
Ban	37
Cause damage/pollution; dangerous; noisy	25
Have no negative impact; no need to change	153
Agree - no comment provided	836
Disagree - no comment provided	500
Total Responses	1551

5.15 Motorised water-sports and personal watercraft

COMMENT	Count
Ban	64
Dangerous; noisy	35
Must be controlled/more restricted; allow in designated areas	115
Need travel corridors in sanctuary zones	9
Have no negative impact; no need to change	189
Agree - no comment provided	710
Disagree - no comment provided	490
Total Responses	1612

6.0 General Comments from Submissions

Many submissions commented on various aspects of the Port Stephens-Great Lakes Marine Park Draft Zoning Plan and the Marine Park in general. These comments have been categorised and are summarised below.

6.1 Commercial Activity

6.1.1 Commercial Fishing

- Commercial fishing should be banned in the marine park.
- Commercial fishing should be banned in enclosed waters.
- Commercial fishing should be more restricted.
- Commercial netting should be banned in the port and estuaries.
- Beach hauling and netting should be banned in HPZs - HPZs should be limited to hand gathering, hand lining and trapping.
- No jet boats should be permitted for beach hauling.
- No explanation why beach hauling is permitted in some HPZs.
- Commercial fishing should not be permitted in habitat protection zones.
- Ban netting during seasonal spawning.
- Beach hauling often conflicts with recreational activities.
- Trapping should be reduced.
- Commercial fishing is only industry impacted by zones as zones are biased towards tourism industries such as diving, resorts, camping areas.
- Requests for the majority of Tilligerry Creek to be general use as it impacts commercial meshing.
- Commercial fishing is a viable and necessary industry as tourists demand local fresh seafood.
- Mesh netting has no impact on marine biodiversity.
- Commercial fishing is necessary to prevent imports from other countries.

- There will be a concentration and transfer of fishing effort to other areas within the marine park as well as outside the park.
- The impact on fishing co-ops will have a flow on effect into the local economy.
- Commercial fishers should be required to obtain permits to operate within the marine park.
- Commercial bait collection should not be permitted at recreational fishing areas.

6.1.2 Buyback

- Commercial fishing buyout must be adequately funded to get the best conservation outcome.
- Commercial buyout must be at least equivalent in effort reduction to the access lost as result of zoning exclusion; must prevent shift to Wallis and Smiths Lakes.
- Current commercial fishing buyback program is inadequate.
- Commercial fishers must have a fair deal.
- Support for buyback of trawlers.

6.1.3 Aquaculture

- Aquaculture should not be permitted in sanctuary zones.
- Various types of aquaculture activity must be reviewed for potential environmental impacts.
- Introduced species such as Pacific oysters should not be permitted.
- No new oyster leases and no expansion of current aquaculture activities.
- Concerns about environmental impacts of fish farming.
- No pearl farming.
- Aquaculture should be encouraged to reduce commercial fishing activity.
- Oyster industry must be permitted to purify oysters.
- Oyster industry should be allowed to expand in current aquaculture areas.
- Pollution that impacts aquaculture must be addressed such as in Tilligerry Creek.

6.1.4 Commercial Dolphin Watching

- May have a detrimental impact on dolphin reproduction.
- There should be allocated areas where no commercial operators are permitted to give dolphins respite.
- Commercial dolphin watch operators must be more regulated.
- Should not be permitted in sanctuary zones.

6.1.5 Commercial Operators

- Some water based commercial operators concerned by impacts on business.
- Some local businesses concerned about impacts if there is a decline in tourism.
- Commercial operators should have industry caps.
- All commercial operators displaced or put out of business by the zoning should be adequately compensated.

6.1.6 Tourism and local economy

- Park will impact tourism and local businesses.
- Protection of natural heritage and economic and social benefits for local communities of a healthy marine environment is beyond measure.
- Will decrease property value.
- Park will increase tourism in future.

6.2 Management

6.2.1 Monitoring and Scientific Data

- What are objectives, strategy, levels of success and milestones to be achieved over time.
- Must be dedicated scientific officer for the marine park.
- Must be full scientific studies and monitoring to evaluate effectiveness of plan and to maximise scientific input into the five year review.
- Lack of data to prove recreational fishing has impact on marine biodiversity.
- Insufficient data to support marine park and zoning.
- Must ensure independent science determines zoning to protect marine wildlife and habitats.

6.2.2 Consultation Process

- Concern that there is no watersport representative on the Marine Park Advisory Committee.
- Request for aquaculture representative on Advisory Committee.
- Request for Boating Industry association representative on Advisory Committee.
- More consultation necessary, park is too rushed.
- More input necessary from locals.
- MPA has taken into consideration a wide range of view points and well consulted with stakeholders.
- The park is a result of political motivation and the 'Green' vote.

6.2.3 Ministerial Discretion

- Ministers should be restricted in what consent may be granted as it may otherwise undermine the intent of a marine park, especially in relation to sanctuary zones.
- Oppose any reduction in the requirement of the relevant Ministers to grant consent via a permit prior to activities being undertaken which disturb habitat, plants or animals (except fish).

6.2.4 Public Education

- Conservation must use science, public education, awareness and participation.
- No accessible opportunities for community education as no SZ in rocky intertidal zone that is accessible to public (Boat Harbour suggested as location).
- Education and awareness program necessary to understand value of a marine park including marketing strategy to promote continued tourism.
- Need for ongoing capacity building and education for users of the marine park.
- The public and tourists need to be educated as it will take time to know different zones and regulations.

6.2.5 Signage and identification of zone boundaries

- Delineation of boundaries needs to be clearly identifiable, especially for visitors; recommendation for signage at boat ramps.
- How will public be able to achieve compliance with the vast number and geographical spread of locations.
- A combination of landmarks and GPS (geographic positioning system) points for zone identification and compliance purposes must remain as simplistic as possible.
- Difficult to identify boundaries especially at sea.
- Zones are fragmented and boundaries will be difficult to recognise and enforce as not everyone has a GPS.

6.2.6 Anchoring

- Request by spearfishing clubs to install a minimum of 15 moorings in the 'no anchoring' zones.
- No anchoring in sanctuary zones.
- No anchoring in sensitive habitat.
- Swing moorings should be replaced with pole moorings to reduce habitat damage.
- Anchoring should be allowed where there is a lack of public moorings.
- Anchoring causes no damage and should be permitted everywhere.
- Anchoring is necessary for safety.
- The use of less damaging anchoring methods such as sandbags should be permitted.

6.3 Recreational Activities

6.3.1 Recreational Fishing

- No recreational fishing restrictions, only commercial restrictions necessary.
- Recreational fishing has no impact on fish stocks/marine biodiversity.
- Scientific data is necessary to prove recreational fishing has an impact before any sanctuary zone can be implemented.
- Catch and release methods should be permitted as there is no impact on biodiversity.
- Recreational fishing is sustainable and controlled by Fisheries.
- Sanctuary zones force boats further out to sea which is a safety issue.
- Bag limits should be more restrictive.
- Current bag limits offer sufficient protection for fish stocks.
- Catch and release methods and/or stricter bag limits should be applied/enforced. instead of implementing sanctuary zones.
- Support seasonal closures for spawning fish.
- Allow seasonal gamefishing in sanctuary zones.
- Allow trolling of lures through all offshore SZs.
- Allow seasonal fishing of some species in SZs.
- Cleaning and stowing of gear while traversing a sanctuary zone should be reconsidered.
- Concern that SZs will cause concentration of effort to other areas within the marine park.
- There should be a reduction in recreational fishing licences as there is less fishing access.
- Proposal to move the Seal Rocks SZ south along Mungo Beach area.
- Concern that there is no mention of Aboriginal traditional ways in the draft zoning plan.

6.3.2 Spearfishing

- Species based spearfishing and fishing competitions should be banned from marine park and only limited species competitions modelled on the Coffs Harbour Bluewater Classic permitted.
- Highly destructive sport and there should be buffer zones around SZs which further restrict spearing.
- Spearfishing competitions are incompatible with the goals of habitat protection zones and should be excluded from the marine park or restricted to general use zones; competitions involve points on the basis of heaviest weight for a target species.
- Spearfishers have no impact on the grey nurse shark or other threatened species.
- Migratory zones to be considered for harvesting of some migratory species in historic spearfishing locations.

- Must be assessed and managed separately from line fishing as spearfishing is selective and sustainable - has no adverse impact on stocks as can target species, size and sometimes sex; weather dependent and requires safe anchoring areas.
- Spearfishing mostly done over reefs in depths of less than 20m and most of these areas are now sanctuary zones; draft zoning plan impacts 60% of historic spearfishing locations and there are limited areas for shore-based spearfishers.
- Should allow spearing for pelagics such as snapper and jewfish.
- Spearfishing is highly weather dependent – activity relies on water clarity, sea swell and wind so these factors greatly restrict activity already.
- Spearfishing would be better managed with size and bag limits and/or closed season on particular species during breeding cycles.
- Accredited spearfishers request special consideration be given for activity in marine park and consideration be given to the taking of some migratory species in SZs (or insert special HPZs).
- Spearfishing clubs propose to develop a code of conduct with MPA and the Department of Primary Industries (DPI) for spearing in GNS areas.

6.3.3 4WD Access

- The Rutile Road should be reopened by National Parks to access beaches along Mungo Beach (Gibber to Gibber).
- 4WDs should not be allowed on beaches adjacent to SZs.
- 4WDs damage dunes and have an impact on biodiversity.
- 4WDs must be more restricted.

6.3.4 Diving

- Diving should not be permitted in sanctuary zones if other activities are banned - “one out all out”.
- Diving should not be permitted in grey nurse shark critical habitat.
- Diving should not be permitted/should be restricted in areas of sensitive habitat.
- Diving has minimal impact.
- Divers can participate in environmental monitoring in sanctuary zones.
- Scuba diving operators report no impact on GNS from divers as they follow a code of conduct.

6.3.5 Motorised water-sports

- Jet skis should be banned in marine park area.
- Noise impacts must be managed.
- Should be banned in HPZs.
- Should be banned near beaches.
- SZs restrict good ski areas.
- Allow in designated areas.
- Must be able to traverse sanctuary zones.
- Have less impact than boats.
- More restrictions necessary to protect swimmers and marine fauna.

6.4 Biodiversity Protection

6.4.1 Conservation/biodiversity protection

- SZs should be larger to incorporate 30-50% of each habitat type.
- More resources and funding for catchment management and land based pollution are necessary.
- The marine park should be larger.

- Zoning plan fails to meet the requirements of the CAR (Comprehensiveness, Adequacy, Representativeness) model for reserve systems.
- Protection necessary for spawning species.
- Activities should be restricted in mangroves.
- Dolphin speed restricted areas should be larger.
- Entire Branch River proposed as SZ.
- An additional SZ proposed in Soldier Point area from east Middle Island to Wanda Wanda head with the shoreline left open as a HPZ.
- Proposals to extend the Soldiers Point HPZ to join with the Tilligerry Creek HPZ and incorporate Lemon Tree Passage.
- Bagnalls Beach proposed as a sanctuary zone.
- Proposals for a habitat protection zone on the west side of the Fly Point to Corrie Island SZ – a HPZ from Bagnalls Beach north to Corrie Island and east to Fly Point
- Bald Point (from the northern end of Celitos Beach to the southern end of Blueys Beach) proposed as a SZ to protect intertidal rocky shore.
- The eastern port proposed to be a HPZ.
- Proposals for a SZ south of Fingal Bay as there are no SZs in that area to offer protection to coastal rocky shore habitat.
- Proposals for a SZ at Morna Point to protect rocky shore and reef habitat.
- The general use areas of the port should be habitat protection zones; no estuarine beach under protection in port – recommendations for Bagnalls, Corlette, Salamander, Jimmys and Shoal Bay Beaches for HPZ.
- Concern with lack of SZs along oceanic beach areas from Hawkes Nest to the Big Gibber.
- Proposal for a HPZ or SZ at Tanilba Bay.
- Proposal for a SZ at Balberook Cove.

6.4.2 Grey Nurse Shark Protection

- All GNS critical habitat areas should be fully protected with minimal 1500m buffer sanctuary zones.
- Current grey nurse shark restrictions are adequate and there should be no additional restrictions.
- GNS population numbers are unsubstantiated.
- Recreational fishers have no impact on GNS.
- Spearfishers have no impact on GNS.
- Divers should be banned in GNS critical habitat.
- Divers can monitor GNS populations.
- Spearfishing clubs propose to develop a code of conduct with MPA and DPI for spearing in GNS areas.

6.4.3 Pollution

- Pollution must be addressed.
- Catchment management is necessary to address pollution that impacts marine environment.
- Pollution in Tilligerry Creek must be addressed.
- Degradation of ecosystems by runoff, stormwater, and sewage must be addressed – sanctuary zones are not necessary.
- Money should be spent on stormwater catchment traps instead of SZs.
- Water quality monitoring strategy necessary.

6.5 Zoning

6.5.1 Sanctuary Zones

- Oppose any sanctuary zones.
- Sanctuary zones are too small and fragmented to achieve adequate protection.
- 20% sanctuary zones provides inadequate protection.
- Vital for biodiversity and protection of marine life.
- Coastal rocky reefs and beach ecosystems are poorly represented in SZs.
- Insufficient sanctuary zones inside the port.
- Small bays should be sanctuary zones as they are overly fished by line and spearfishing.
- Many habitats are underrepresented in the marine park and SZs should include 30-50% of each habitat type.
- Sanctuary zones are too big and restrictive.
- Northern end of the marine park is bearing the weight of the sanctuary zones – uneven zoning of areas between north and south.

6.5.2 Wallis Lake

- Wallis Lake should have been included in marine park.
- Wallis Lake should be made a recreational fishing haven.
- There will be a transfer of commercial and recreational fishing effort to Wallis Lake as a result of the marine park.
- Wallis Lake should be included in the marine park at the five year review.

Appendix 1 – Organisations that Commented on the Draft Zoning Plan

Abalone Management Advisory Committee
Anglers Action Group (Sydney Northside) Inc
Australian Fishing Tackle Association Inc
Australian Marine Conservation Society
Australian Marine Sciences Association (NSW Branch)
Australian Workers Union
Boating Industry Association NSW
Broughton Island Conservation Society Incorporated
Canberra Fisherman's Club Incorporated
Commercial Fishermen's Co-operative Ltd (Head Office-Wickham)
Department of Lands
Department of Natural Resources, Newcastle
DPI Fisheries - Wallis Lake District Office
EcoNetwork - Port Stephens Inc.
Great Lakes Council
Great Lakes Environment Association
Hornsby RSL Fishing Club
Hunter Community Environment Centre
Hunter Water
Hunter-Central Rivers Catchment Management Authority
Karuah Motor Yacht Club
Kiama Game Fishing Club
Lake Macquarie Fish Management Advisory Group
Maitland City Offshore Fishing Club Inc
Myall Lakes Recreational Access Association
National Parks Association of NSW
Nature Conservation Council of NSW
New South Wales Game Fishing Association Inc
Newcastle and Port Stephens GameFish Club
Newcastle District Anglers Association Inc
Newcastle Neptunes Underwater Club Inc
North Arm Cove Resident's Association
North Shore Underwater Club
Parks and Playgrounds Movement Inc.
Port Macquarie Game Fishing Club
Port Stephens Council
Port Stephens Greens
Recreational Anglers Stakeholders Group
Responsible Fishing Association of NSW
Revesby Workers Spearfishing Club
Seafood Quality Assurance Association; Handgathers Association; Newcastle Co-op
Seal Rocks Protection Society
Shoal Bay Fishing Club
St George Spearfishing and Freediving Club Inc
Taree Fish Co-op
The Marine & Coastal Community Network
The Myall Koala & Environmental Support Group Inc
The Wilderness Society Newcastle Inc
Toronto RSL Fishing Club
Underwater Skindivers and Fisherman's Association
UNSW - School of Biological, Earth & Environmental Sciences
Wallis Lake Fishermen's Co-operative Ltd

Appendix 2 – Petitions

Petitions that were sent to the Legislative Council of the NSW Parliament are listed below.

- 1220 individuals signed a petition stating their opposition to the proposed Batemans and Port Stephens-Great Lakes Marine Parks and requested that the House postpone any move to create the proposed marine parks until adequate and effective consultation has been conducted with all members of the fishing industry and the community, a socio-economic study has been undertaken to determine how the marine parks will affect commercial and recreational fishers and the community, and real data is made available on the endangered species that the marine park hopes to protect.
- 100 individuals signed a petition stating that as recreational fishers they object to any restrictions on fishing in the Mid North coast waters and if the marine park is declared that they oppose any ban or surcharge on recreational fishing or diving.