

Community Reference Committee for the proposed South Coast Marine Park

Meeting One: Draft Minutes

15-16 December 2021

Esperance Civic Centre

CRC Members: Fran Logan (Chair), Rob Stewart, Kirsty Alexander, Kim Colero, Karen Milligan, Kim Bennett, Manue Daniels, Nathan McQuoid, Wayne Daw, Helen McCarthy, Ron Chambers, Kristen Perks (Day one only), Ken Richardson.

SAG Observers (Day one only): Luke Twomey (WAMSI), Daryl Hockey (WAFIC), Christabel Mitchell (Pew), Matthew Gillett (RFW), Sue Starr (Local environment and Climate Change), Jan Archer (Local environment and Climate Change), Viv Bowkett (Local environment and Climate Change). Alex Leonard (Esperance Port), Marcus Falconer (Tourism)

CPC: John Keesing (Day one only)

DBCA: Mark Webb (Day one only), Peter Sharp, Colin Ingram, Tasman Douglas, Liesl Ludgerus, Mark Sheridan, Chris Nutt, Lori-Ann Shibish, Sarah Bignell, Todd James.

DPIRD: Heather Brayford (Day one only), Tim Nicholas, Brent Wise, Russell Adams, Jess Ngeh, Kimberly Jenkins

ETNTAC: David Guilfoyle, Doc Reynolds (Day one only), Donna Beach, Andrew Beck

Apologies: Ralph Addis (DG DPIRD)

Day One: Commenced 9am

1.1 Welcome to Country - Doc Reynolds, Donna Beach - Mr Reynolds and Ms Beach presented an ETNTAC produced video and noted traditional owner future aspirations for country. They noted that the Community Reference Committee (CRC) would have to make concessions to protect the marine environment for future generations. They wished the CRC well in their deliberations

1.2 Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA) DG Address- Mark Webb; Mr Webb thanked ETNTAC representatives for the welcome to country; CRC members for nominating; the Chair Hon Fran Logan; DPIRD and DBCA staff for their collaboration; traditional owner joint management partners; and sector advisory group (SAG) chairs. He stated that the CRC was established to provide a transparent process in community interactions during the iterative, challenging and focussed planning process. He stated that the Ministers for Environment and Fisheries were clear that a south coast marine park is a priority; that collective and historical knowledge will inform the management plan; and that he was looking forward to hearing the conversation about the marine park.

1.3 Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) DDG Address- Heather Brayford: Ms Brayford emphasised that this was the first time DPIRD has been involved in a marine planning process from the start and it is important that DPIRD are involved. She congratulated CRC members on their appointment and thanked SAGs for their contributions. She stated that this is a challenging and multi-stakeholder process that will be collaborative. She stated that she is looking forward to the process, and thanked Mark Webb for including DPIRD in the process.

1.4 CRC Member Introductions: All CRC members gave a brief statement about their background

1.5 Housekeeping: The chair raised possible arrangements for future meetings with regard to COVID.

<i>Action 1/1: Organise an online discussion with CRC members regarding future meetings if COVID measures are in place</i>
--

1.6 CRC Terms of Reference: The Chair reminded the CRC that, as community representatives, their role is to provide recommendations and advice and that government, via Ministers and Cabinet, makes the final decisions on the marine park. The Conservation and Parks Commission (CPC) and DBCA playing an important role. He noted government's commitment to joint management with traditional owners, noting that in other areas, joint management is working well and providing benefits to local people, traditional owners and parks. He noted DPIRDs involvement in the planning process; the SAGs critical role in providing direct advice; and that SAG and CRC interactions are a two-way street. The function of the CRC to 'provide local knowledge and advice on environmental, cultural and socio-economic values of the proposed marine park, including relevant information on activities and uses of the area' was discussed.

Discussion ensued regarding that SAGs can provide in-confidence information to government that the CRC may not see; the structure of the management plan driving the CRC discussions; the way the planning process and the implementation of the marine park are funded via a request to Treasury for a new allocation of money; and that as the marine park comes under Government's Plan For Our Parks policy, there is an obligation for Treasury to fund the outcomes. It was noted that there is a discrepancy on the community engagement flow diagram between the various documents with no arrow between 'community' and 'CRC' in some cases.

Discussion continued regarding in-confidence information and what could be discussed with the community, including the media; and that the CRC do not have a right to attend SAG meetings but that SAGs will be presenting on day one of each meeting.

It was noted that the CRC do not need to come to consensus on issues and if required, all opinions can be provided in CRC advice.

Discussion continued regarding communications before and between meetings. It was noted that DBCA will provide the meeting package a fortnight prior to CRC meetings and that communication between meetings will be via a group email.

<i>ACTION 1/2: fix the diagram in the TOR to include an arrow between 'community' and 'CRC'.</i>
<i>Action 1/3: Provide further clarification and boundaries around what the CRC can say in the community</i>
<i>ACTION 1/4: Communiques to be available immediately post meeting via special newsletter and on the website.</i>
<i>Action 1/5: set up a CRC group email address.</i>

1.7 Code of Conduct: Discussed.

1.8 Conflict of interest (COI): If there is a COI issue, it will be noted. CRC members will not be excluded from discussions based on COI.

1.9 Conservation and Parks Commission (CPC) address- John Keesing: Mr Keesing thanked traditional owners for the welcome to country and the CRC for the opportunity to present. He described his professional background and described the CPC role and function to provide independent advice to the Minister for Environment. He stated that the CPC, via DBCA, prepares management plans and monitors the condition of marine parks. He noted that marine parks will be jointly managed with traditional owners and highlighted the cultural heritage protection purpose of marine parks. He noted that the CPC values the consultation process and supports the CRC, SAGs and community information sessions to gather community aspirations, expectations and concerns. He congratulated the CRC members on their appointment.

1.10 Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) Role- Jess Ngeh: Ms Ngeh gave a powerpoint presentation (attached).

Ms Ngeh advised that oyster aquaculture is not being undertaken in the study area; that there is no current proposal for an aquaculture development zone for Esperance; that DPIRD undertakes monitoring of fish at a stock level, not in individual sanctuary zones; sanctuary zone research funding is used in collaboration with DBCA; and that DPIRD applies ecosystem-based fisheries management (e.g. marine heatwave impacts on abalone stocks).

Action 1/6: DPIRD to provide info on climate change impacts and assessments

2. Proposal background and reason for marine park boundaries - Chris Nutt and Sarah Bignell - Mr Nutt and Ms Bignell gave power-point presentations (attached).

Mr Nutt clarified for the CRC options available if traditional owners do not want to enter into joint management. While DBCA will offer joint management where there is existing native title, an Indigenous Land Use Agreement (ILUA) with traditional owners is required. In the ocean, native title can be exclusive or non-exclusive. A marine park can be created with joint management; or without joint management but with consent of traditional owners; or created with joint management to follow later.

Discussion ensued regarding the types of restrictions that can be applied under various regulations in general use zones (eg speed restrictions, fisheries regulations, dog restrictions).

Action 1/7: CALM Act and other relevant regulations to be circulated to CRC members.

Discussion continued regarding the extensive process to review an existing zoning scheme and the need to implement the best zoning scheme possible; that the study area is Bremer Bay eastward to the South Australian border as a result of government policy setting and Cabinet decision; that existing land tenures (eg port waters) cannot be included in the marine park; the interaction between Commonwealth and State marine parks; and the requirement for the CRC to make a boundary recommendation.

3.1 Port and Industry SAG Alex Leonard (Esperance Port) – Mr Leonard emphasised the important role of the Port in the community. He stated that in previous meetings with DBCA, he was assured that proposed zoning would not impact on port activities including dredging, anchorages or passage of commercial vessels. Port water boundaries are about to be amended for a reduction in inshore and outer waters- the relinquished inshore area will not be part of the marine park. He stated that the Port currently meets water quality criteria and expressed a desire to further discuss aquaculture in Port waters with DPIRD. A Memorandum of Agreement specific to Esperance Port would need to be developed and emergency access provisions need discussion. There is the potential for a second port development site at Butty Head- although it is unlikely, he stated that Department of Transport (DoT) would prefer to have no reserve over that area, however no spatial boundaries were supplied.

Discussion ensued regarding dredging being the biggest water quality issue the Port has, however it only happened once every 12-15 years and the dredge spoil is sandy with low amounts of silt so turbidity is low; that ballast water is exchanged in international water and so not in the marine park; whether the marine park affects wind turbine green hydrogen development; and that Bandy Creek is managed by DoT.

3.2 Recreational Fishing SAG - Matthew Gillett (Recfishwest) – Recfishwest (RFW) has 18 staff and is the peak recreational fishing body, representing 750,000 recreational fishers in WA. RFW supports great fishing experiences that are enjoyable sustainable and safe. RFW have a service level agreement with Government to provide advice on recreational fishing, but also undertakes other projects. RFW capabilities include advocacy and representation, consulting, citizen science, artificial reefs, engagement and outreach. They have a state-wide reach via newsletters, an app, website, social media and radio.

Mr Gillett advised that a recreational fishing economic study has shown that this activity is valued at \$2.4 billion dollars state-wide, with \$200 million being spent by residents of the Great Southern and Goldfields. He stated that the community values healthy habitats that provide abundant fish stocks, access to high quality fishing experiences for target species, spending time with family and connecting with nature, with catching a fish a lower priority. The Recreational fishing SAG will include up to 12 members, including fishing clubs, with a current EOI for south coast from Albany-Esperance, seeking people with diverse recreational fishing experience. Mr Gillett advised that the south coast caters for shore and boat based, nearshore, estuarine and offshore amateur to avid recreational fishers, and provided wilderness fishing experiences.

Mr Gillett advised that RFW supports marine parks and that the recreational fishing community is supportive of marine parks, but ask that recreational fishing restrictions are evidence based. He stated that marine parks can enhance recreational fishing experiences when rec fishing economic and social values fishing economic and social values are recognised. He stated that RFW want to hear views from other stakeholders and are looking for innovative management including zoning but also using Fisheries tools. He stated RFW will advocate for wilderness conservation areas. Recreational fisher concerns about marine parks were noted as loss of access to fishing areas, where an area is closed to fishing the 'value' of that area is lost; confusion about zoning rules; concentration of fishing in open areas; and out-of-date management plans.

Mr Gillett noted that the large study area would be able to meet marine park objectives, be complementary with existing marine parks, and provide cross shelf connectivity. He stated that, based on consensus of their constituents, RFW would prefer the western boundary to be aligned with the western boundary of the Commonwealth Bremer Bay Marine Park at Dempster Inlet and that RFW did not have strong views on the eastern boundary and were happy for it to extend to the WA border. In summary he stated that recreational fishing is important on the south coast, that RFW support marine parks and that recreational fishing is compatible with conservation.

Discussion ensued about RFW's proposed western boundary as there are Australian sea-lion haul out, white shark foraging and whale breeding areas at the Doubtful Islands; exclusion of Bremer Bay would mean that granite headlands not represented elsewhere would be excluded; the high level of consultation that RFW had done with local fishing clubs; and the possible impact on Bremer Bay based recreational fishers if the boundary extended further west than the RFW proposal.

3.3 Commercial Fishing SAG -Daryl Hockey (WAFIC) – The south coast hosts important fisheries. Most of the catch from these fisheries is consumed locally or in Perth apart from some crab, southern rock lobster and abalone which is mostly exported. Commercial fishers live and fish locally, traversing large areas of inshore, nearshore and deep sea environments, using nets, lines and traps. Mr Hockey stated that commercial fishing in WA is well managed (with 90% of fisheries in WA with Marine Stewardship Council certification) and marine parks are not used to protect fisheries sustainability. Commercial fishing requires clean waters and healthy habitats to maintain sustainable fish stocks and fishers see themselves as custodians and conservationists. He stated that fishers need certainty of access to plan for the future financially - a marine park increases difficulty of borrowing money for commercial fishing purposes and no other sector is likely to be as impacted as commercial fishing.

Mr Hockey stated that while the compensation process for Ngari Capes Marine Park is lengthy and incomplete and commercial fishers were not adequately consulted in the Buccaneer Archipelago Marine Parks process, he is more comfortable with the south coast process and pleased with CRC membership. He noted that there is anxiety in the industry about impacts of exclusion zones on fishers and their families and that fishers have unique knowledge to bring to the table and want to be consulted early. He stated that decisions need to be based on science and evidence and that resources need to be directed to addressing science gaps. He also

noted that displaced effort must be considered; decisions should be made in consideration of where fish are located (demersal v pelagic) and methods of fishing; spillover benefits from sanctuary zones may not occur; the impacts of sanctuary zones must be known; different fisheries have different impacts; and that the south coast marine environment is protected by the weather.

Mr Hockey advised that he had insufficient time to consult with the 22 member SAG on the boundary, however generally accepted that it should start at Bremer (as long as there was no sanctuary zone in this area due to high fishing activity) and noted that there needed to be scientific reasons for the size of the marine park. Mr Hockey provided a piece of barramundi from Vietnam to the CRC stating that 22,000 tonnes of seafood is imported every year to WA and that if local fisheries are locked up, more seafood will be imported.

Discussion ensued regarding addressing science gaps and using geomorphology as a surrogate for biodiversity, the availability of recreational and commercial fishing data, the value of recreational and commercial fishing and whether there is competition between recreational and commercial fishers. Commercial fishing catch and effort data (10 years of data compiled) and state-wide recreational boat-based fishing information is available. DBCA are developing a spatial tool with UWA to gather data on how people use coastal and marine environments. It was noted that temperate shark and herring stocks are recovering and reduced catch and quota levels for abalone, southern rock lobster and crystal crabs may be reduced.

<i>ACTION 1/8: DPIRD to provide commercial and recreational fishing data to CRC.</i>
--

<i>Action 1/9: Provide the FRDC study on abalone spillover from translocated populations; and the South Coast Demersal Assessment to the CRC when it is published in 2022.</i>
--

3.4 Local environment and Climate Change SAG - Sue Starr (LEAF) – Ms Starr advised that the Local environment and Climate Change SAG is co-chaired with Ms Jan Archer. She stated that while there is a connection to the ocean, it is not pristine, all areas have been impacted and the marine environment needs to be preserved. She noted that climate change impacts that need to be mitigated are rapid, absorption of atmospheric CO2 leading to acidification, ocean warming, storm damage on coasts and tropical species migrating southwards. She noted the need for sustainable management and restoration of the marine environment to maintain ecosystem services, and the need for ecologically sustainable practices. She requested no drilling or exploration for fossil fuels and monitoring effects of climate change in the marine park, as well as suggesting a research centre to be developed in Esperance. Ms Starr raised concerns about the impacts of marine pollution (nets, ropes, plastic debris, etc) and that it is not being managed, the need to determine point sources of pollution (rubbish from large ships, waste from commercial and recreational fishing, etc) and that local volunteers do beach clean-ups with no government agency support. She stated that the boundary should be as large as possible, that zoning is essential and Bremer Bay Canyon needs special protection.

3.5 Tourism SAG - Marcus Falconer (Australia's Golden Outback) - Mr Falconer advised that Australia's Golden Outback (funded by Tourism WA) is a membership organisation representing tourism interests with a role of destination marketing and holistic destination management. Tourism is increasing in WA (at 10% per year) and COVID has increased this further. There is an opportunity to manage that increase by supporting sustainable tourism developments while allowing access to people. Tourism WA runs consumer demand surveys that rate world class nature as the 2-3rd factor that drives international visitation to Australia. Sentiment from the local tourism industry is that they are part of the community and want to see tourism grow but in a sustainable way to maintain the natural assets that they rely on. Over the next 5-10- years, determination of the experiences that are going to appeal to target audiences is required, possibly with a higher yield, lower volume scenario. Mr Falconer stated that investment in tourism along the coastline with new experiences should be encouraged.

Discussion ensued regarding anecdotal evidence that the protected natural environment of marine parks is viewed as a tourism asset; and comparisons were made between weather conditions along the south coast and Ningaloo, as to how this would affect the tourism industry.

3.6 NGO Environment SAG - Christabel Mitchell (Pew) – Ms Mitchell advised that the NGO Environment SAG comprises Australian Marine Conservation Society, Pew, Save Our Marine Life Alliance, Conservation Council of WA and the Centre for Conservation Geography. She acknowledged that this SAG is not local but emphasised their role as ENGOs involved in the Commonwealth marine parks processes throughout Australia and that they have learnt and know what a good outcome looks like. She stated that this SAG wants to see, and will support, a good result for the community. She noted that this SAG has begun collecting data and working with the community to achieve a good outcome. Ms Mitchell stated that the boundary proposal is supported; the larger boundary allows for a range of different uses; this is an iconic marine park opportunity; the boundary will include a range of different habitats; extending eastward makes sense to incorporate another bioregion; and a larger boundary gives more zoning design flexibility. She noted that information gathering is important and the SAG would like to participate in that process; and that the Comprehensive, Adequate, and Representative principles is how Australia manages its marine environment and that gaps in science are not such an issue when using this model. She stated that she can be more specific about the boundary after consulting with the SAG. Ms Mitchell will investigate providing the CRC with a report on south coast marine values.

3.7 Science SAG - Luke Twomey (WAMSI)- WAMSI is not a peak body, rather a service provider and source of science information. It is an unincorporated joint venture between DBCA, DPIRD, DEWR, JTSI, AIMS, Museum WA, Chemcentre and universities. The 17 member Science SAG has 100+ years of experience in various marine science disciplines including social science, law, benthic science, fisheries and marine mammals. The SAG has met once and are satisfied that this is a representative area and home to many endemic short-range species. Mr Twomey advised that WAMSI pursues science opportunities to help state government with decision making. WAMSI investigates issues and asks the community what they need. WAMSI collects information, undertakes a gap analysis, matches the outcome of the analysis to the requests that have been made and prioritises these. This process is complete for Shark Bay and WAMSI is funded to undertake a science gap analysis of the south coast in 2022.

Discussion ensued regarding impacts on the south coast marine environment including human pressures, nutrients going into estuaries carbon in the atmosphere; and what pressures the marine park might remediate. It was stated that the CRC needs to work with the information that is available about habitat types, geomorphology, species and life cycles and that while there may be gaps in marine science knowledge, this is enough information to make informed decisions. Knowledge gaps will be rectified over time as more research funds are attracted to the south coast as a result of the marine park.

The CRC requested high level information regarding what DBCA will be providing to the committee and more information about cultural values.

<i>ACTION 1/10: DBCA provide high level tabs about what we will be provided to the CRC at subsequent meetings.</i>
--

<i>ACTION 1/11: ETNTAC representatives to present on cultural values at the next meeting</i>
--

Meeting closed 4.25pm

Day Two: Commenced 9 am

Apologies; Doc Reynolds, Kristen Perks.

4.1 Boundary discussion - The Chair recapped the previous day's discussion and advised that the way the boundary was being determined in this process is different to other marine park processes where the boundary was determined by Government.

Discussion ensued regarding the indicative management plan process, timing and boundary. It was noted that the boundary can change up to the release of the indicative management plan for public comment, but once the plan has been released for comment the boundary can only be made smaller not larger, so a bigger boundary is advised. Once the boundary is legislated, it can only be changed through an act of parliament, for example if a development such as a loading facility was required. It was reiterated that there are three broad objectives for the design of the PSCMP namely, biodiversity conservation, protect and conserve Aboriginal culture and heritage, and provide for ongoing ecologically sustainable use. The sequence of application is important as we aim to conserve biodiversity while minimising impacts to use.

Members asked where sanctuary zones are intended. DBCA stated that it is at the start of the process and that the management framework is being built in collaboration with the CRC. Once a boundary has been defined, recommendations for zoning based on science and use will be presented to the CRC which will then provide the community point of view. The boundary is the jurisdictional framework and an important decision, but it is the management arrangements that cause restrictions. A larger boundary will provide more flexibility for zoning arrangements.

Discussion continued regarding the remoteness of some of the areas and the difficulties of patrolling and compliance. There will be a light touch in compliance in the more remote areas with different levels of management for different zones, and the cost of compliance will be factored into the Cabinet funding request for implementation. There is a government expectation that this marine park will provide traditional owner employment along the south coast.

The boundary principles and marine park objectives were recapped. The use of surrogates where data is deficient was explained. The available GIS layers that will inform the planning process were explained. They include nautical charts, oceanographic layers, infrastructure, coastline classifications, geomorphology, geological surrogates and ecosystem layers. The marine park boundary is intended to start at the high-water mark and extend to the limit of state waters over which DBCA can have jurisdiction and apply the CALM Act. DPIRD has jurisdiction to the 200NM Exclusive Economic Zone. The landward boundary of the marine park will be subject to availability of adjacent terrestrial tenure, including whether that tenure extends to the high or low water mark.

Discussion continued regarding state waters which in much of the study area extends 5-6 km offshore except in the vicinity of the Recherche Archipelago where the territorial sea baseline around the islands extends the limit of state waters at least 50-60km offshore. While for ease of identification the limit of WA coastal waters (i.e. state waters) is used as the offshore boundary, it does not have to be followed. Activity between the high and low water marks needs to be considered in the planning process so as a starting point, the high water mark as identified in the *Land Administration Act*, is appropriate as the landward boundary.

The inclusion of estuaries in the marine park was discussed. Estuaries are significant culturally and environmentally and are important for recreational and commercial fishing. DPIRD has jurisdiction over fishing in all inland waters including estuaries. Estuaries may not be included in national parks (tenure to be clarified) and if they are seasonally closed or not tidal there may also be limitations to their inclusion in the marine park (yet to be clarified). DBCA has begun the process of investigating adjacent terrestrial tenure and the status of the south coast estuaries and will aim to provide this information for the next CRC meeting.

Discussion continued regarding the unique granite headlands at Hood Point that are not represented elsewhere; that the area around Fitzgerald National Park has quartzite mountains of a different geological

origin; that study area waters around Hopetoun are no deeper than 70m; that islands from west to east in the study area are different; the location of underwater canyons; and where mining leases are located.

ACTION 1/12: Provide Commonwealth mining and petroleum leases information to the CRC.

4.2 ETNTAC presentation regarding boundary - David Guilfoyle and Andrew Beck – Esperance Tjaltjraak Native Title Aboriginal Corporation (ETNTAC) is the native title corporation which represents Wajarri, the people of Kepa Kurl. ETNTAC endorses the study area boundary as per the proposal. Mr Guilfoyle described the Esperance Tjaltjraak native title determination boundary as a compromise political process as there are no straight cultural lines. He stated that ETNTAC is in a better position than other groups as they have held native title longest and were happy to answer questions about the cultural landscape and values. Mr Guilfoyle emphasised that while he could only speak for Esperance Tjaltjraak, there are strong relations with the Wagyl Kaip and Ngadju with cultural obligations to look after country with others. He advised that ETNTAC has a sea country plan, developed via workshops with elders, which includes 30 years of cultural mapping including on the sea floor. He noted that the Esperance Tjaltjraak recognise that joint management will help enable actions in the sea country plan - including in estuaries and waterways. He stated that ETNTAC will undertake a cultural information gathering process with elders and rangers as well as community before the next CRC meeting. Mr Beck reiterated Esperance Tjaltjraak connection with Ngadju across three clan groups and noted that caring for country was not defined by boundaries. He stated that Esperance Tjaltjraak want to be recognised and acknowledged for their connection to and love for country. He noted that Esperance Tjaltjraak have a cultural obligation to care for country, so no matter what decision is made about the marine park boundary, caring for country will continue as part of their being. He assured the CRC that meetings would be discussed with the Circle of Elders whom the Esperance Tjaltjraak attendees were representing and information from those meetings will inform the planning process. He described the boundary and status of native title in the area.

On questioning by the CRC, ETNTAC representatives elaborated that that cultural heritage places include social and spiritual connections, songlines along rivers based on ecological understandings which continue into sea country, islands and cultural features and submerged cultural places. Managing the values of these areas where people have been removed is important, as the trauma continues until the opportunity to manage is given back. It was stated that ETNTAC welcomes the opportunity to manage country with extra resources and jobs and with funding, structures, ranger programs and research collaborations, can bring a lot to the table. A cultural values overlay will be provided.

Boundary discussion (continued) - The Chair invited members to express their views on the marine park boundary. Views expressed included that most members supported the boundary which will give opportunity to meet marine park objectives; some would like to see the boundary extend westward but accept that government direction was to consider from Bremer Bay eastward; the boundary is acceptable but the zoning with regard to safety for small boat fishing in the Recherche must be considered; the complexity of the seaward boundary and inclusion of estuaries needs to be further considered, but use the high water mark and include estuaries where possible; the estuaries along the south coast are culturally and ecologically important, different chemically and support unique flora and fauna, however if tenure issues around estuaries are going to delay the process then exclude them early; concerns as to how a general use zone may affect activities or access affects the ability to make a boundary decision; there was a need for Commercial Fishing SAG and community input before making a final boundary recommendation; a larger boundary is better; connectivity between terrestrial national parks and offshore Commonwealth parks is important; whether offshore islands in state waters surrounded by Commonwealth marine parks should be included; that Twilight Cove is a significant area; that state and Commonwealth intergovernmental agreements for marine parks are important for management; and cultural values does necessarily conflict with other uses.

ACTION 1/13: Presentation to be provided at the next meeting on the CALM Act and CALM Act regulations available to govern the responsibilities of running the marine park – also send a discussion paper to the CRC.

The Chair summarised that the outstanding boundary issues are inshore tenure interacting with the landward boundary (including estuaries) and the inclusion of offshore islands. He noted there were concerns about lack of input from commercial fishing interests, but the Commercial Fishing SAG will present their final position at the next meeting. The intent is to make the final boundary recommendation at meeting two.

4.3 Spatial Tool - Sarah Bignell (DBCAs) – Ms Bignell gave a presentation on the spatial use capture tool that DCBA is developing in collaboration with UWA. The intent of the tool is to allow the community to easily provide information on how they use the proposed marine park area.

Discussion ensued regarding the background information layers that will be used (depth, distant, latitudes and longitudes), how the tool will be used (face to face, in workshops and available online), how sample size might affect data, how data can be disaggregated between recreational and commercial fishing, and that data will be collected as ‘time per year spent’ on an activity. DPIRD advised they can also provide further commercial fishing data to support the process across the 12 commercial fisheries including catch and effort data, stock assessment and sustainability criteria.

5. Next steps - The CRC discussed future meeting dates which will be circulated to members and finalised the public communique. A request was made to send information to the CRC as it becomes available rather than in the meeting package. Members were asked to provide a short bio for the website. Items to be covered in meeting 2 were discussed and the Chair thanked the CRC.

ACTION 1/14: CRC members to do a bio for the website and newsletter
--

ACTION 1/15: SAG chair details on the website
--

ACTION 1/16: Send information to the CRC as it becomes available.
--

Meeting closed 2.45pm.

Action items

Number	Action	Responsibility	Timing	Comments
1/1	<i>Organise an online discussion with CRC members regarding future meetings if COVID measures are in place</i>	Lori-Ann Shibish (DBCA)	End of January	
1/2	<i>Fix the diagram in the TOR to include an arrow between 'community' and 'CRC'.</i>	Lori-Ann Shibish (DBCA)	Mid February	Provide to the CRC and update online
1/3	<i>Provide further clarification and boundaries around what the CRC can say in the community</i>	Liesl Ludgerus (DBCA)	Mid February	
1/4	<i>Communiqués to be available immediately post meeting via special newsletter and on the website.</i>	Lori-Ann Shibish (DBCA)	Ongoing	
1/5	<i>Set up a CRC group email address</i>	Lori-Ann Shibish (DBCA)		
1/6	<i>DPIRD to provide info on climate change impacts and assessments</i>	Jess Ngeh (DPIRD)	Mid February	
1/7	<i>CALM Act and other relevant regulations to be circulated to CRC members</i>	Chris Nutt (DBCA)/ Todd James (DBCA)	Mid February	
1/8	<i>DPIRD to provide commercial and recreational fishing data to CRC.</i>	Jess Ngeh (DPIRD)		
1/9	<i>Provide the FRDC study on abalone spillover from translocated populations; and the South Coast Demersal Assessment to the CRC when it is published in 2022.</i>	Jess Ngeh (DPIRD)	TBA	
1/10	<i>DBCA provide high level tabs about what we will be provided to the CRC at subsequent meetings.</i>	Chris Nutt (DBCA)/ Todd James (DBCA)	Mid February	
1/11	<i>ETNTAC representatives to present on cultural values at the next meeting</i>	Chriss Nutt (DBCA)/Tas Douglass (DBCA)	Next CRC meeting	
1/12	<i>Provide Commonwealth mining and petroleum leases information to the CRC</i>	Mark Sheridan (DBCA)/ Chris Nutt (DBCA)	Mid February	
1/13	<i>Presentation to be provided at the next meeting on the CALM Act and CALM Act regulations available to govern the responsibilities of running the marine park – also send a discussion paper to the CRC.</i>	Chris Nutt (DBCA)/ Todd James (DBCA)	Mid February	
1/14	<i>CRC members to do a bio for the website and newsletter</i>	Lori-Ann Shibish (DBCA)	End of January	

1/15	<i>SAG chair details on the website</i>	Lori-Ann Shibish (DBCA)	Mid January	
1/16	<i>Send information to the CRC as it becomes available</i>	All	Ongoing	