



**HAVE YOUR SAY**

- This response form can only be used in conjunction with the attached Regulatory Impact Statement/ Draft Public Benefit Test (RIS/PBT), which contains the detail of the proposed amendments and alternatives.
- Your response on this particular form enables us to undertake a valid statistical analysis.
- Petitions and form letters are often impossible to include in a statistical summary of RIS/PBT responses.
- Positive and negative feedback is equally important.
- You do not need to provide a response on all the proposals. Additional sheets may be added if you need more space.
- All comments will be used in the development of a final position for each proposal.
- Copies of the RIS/PBT and this response form are available at:

[www.dpi.qld.gov.au/fishweb](http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/fishweb)

**Submitting your response:**

**Mail to:**

Grey Nurse Shark Joint RIS/PBT  
 Queensland Fisheries Service  
 Department of Primary Industries  
 GPO Box 46  
 Brisbane Qld 4001

**Fax:**

(07) 3225 1823

**Hand deliver to:**

Level 2  
 80 Ann Street  
 BRISBANE QLD

**Grey Nurse Shark  
 Regulatory Impact  
 Statement/draft Public Benefit  
 Test**

**Response Form**

**Queensland Fisheries Service  
 must receive responses by:  
 (5pm, 17 November 2003)**

**Your details**

Name:

Address:

**Nature of submission**

(Please circle one category only)

**Individual**                      Group

(Please specify group)

**Please circle the category which best describes your interest.**

Commercial fisher    Recreational fisher

Indigenous fisher    Charter boat operator

Conservationist      Tackle and bait supplier

**Diver**                              Other (specify)

**Section A**    **Nature conservation legislation (refers to section 8.1 in RIS/PBT)**

**Question 1**    **Do you support or not support Proposal One (see section 8.1 in RIS/PBT)?**

- Support (go to question 2)     Don't support (go to question 2)     Don't know/no comment (go to question 2)

Comments:

**Full Support** - Studies say as little as 300 to 500 individuals left and that definitely warrants an endangered listing under the Nature Conservation Act 1992.

**Question 2**    **Do you support or not support the development of a conservation plan for the species (see section 8.1 in RIS/PBT)?**

- Support (go to question 3a)     Don't support (go to question 3a)     Don't know/no comment (go to question 3a)

Comments:

**Full Support** - Protective measures are definitely needed. If nothing is done to protect the grey nurse sharks, they might be extinct in between 7 and 40 years.

**Section B**    **Proposed areas for closures**

**Question 3a**    **Indicate whether you support or do not support a whole of year or a seasonal\* closure to minimise FISHING impacts on grey nurse sharks (see sections 7.2 and 7.3 in RIS/PBT)?**

You are asked to comment on the actual size of the closure in Question 4. \* A seasonal closure means no diving between March to December inclusive (see section 7.3 in RIS/PBT)

- Support annual (go to question 3b)     Support seasonal (go to question 3b)     Don't support either (go to question 3b)  
 Don't know/no comment (go to question 3b)

Comments:

**Full Support for annual fishing closure** - Hook and line fishing is the greatest threat to the survival of the grey nurse sharks. 30% of observed sharks have hooks in their mouth, 80% of autopsied sharks have hooks in their throat or stomach; hooks and the resulting infections and septicaemia are by far the main reasons for unnatural grey nurse sharks deaths. Fishing within these sites threatens the survival of the grey nurse sharks and all forms of hook and line fishing must be removed.

**Question 3b**    **Do you support or not support the concept of having an annual or seasonal\* closure to minimise DIVING impacts on grey nurse sharks (see sections 7.2 and 7.3 in RIS/PBT)?** You are asked to comment on the actual size of the closure in Question 4. \* A 'seasonal closure' means no fishing between March to December inclusive (see section 7.3 in RIS/PBT)

- Support annual (go to question 4)     Support seasonal (go to question 4)     Don't support either (go to question 4)  
 Don't know/no comment (go to question 4)

Comments:

**No Support for annual or seasonal diving closures** - Diving is not considered a key impact to the grey nurse sharks, particularly when divers are managed appropriately. Over the last three years, the diving community has been very supportive in adopting and abiding by the voluntary GNS diving code of conduct but also in filling out surveys for the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Services. There is no scientific evidence to suggest that divers adhering to the code of conduct have more than a negligible impact on the grey nurse sharks. Divers are an important source of information about grey

nurse sharks numbers and migration.

**Question 4** If you support area closures, do you support or not support all of the distances proposed in the map below? Questions about the types of fishing and diving activities that should be allowed in the areas are asked in sections C and D.

Support (go to question 6)       Don't support (go to question 5)       Don't know/no comment (go to question 6)

(There is space to provide comments for this question on page 6)

Comments (from question 4):

**Support 1.2 km, but 1.5 km would be better, as a round zone with distance expressed in nautical miles** – Recent studies in both Queensland (Flat Rock) and New South Wales (Fish Rock) have clearly demonstrated that the grey nurse sharks do actually travel up to 1.2km from the site and throughout the water column to forage. A 200m protection zone + 800m buffer zone (as implemented in New South Wales) is totally ineffective.

**Question 5** If you do not support the proposed distances in the map but do support having an area closure, indicate which distance you would support. Questions about the types of fishing and diving activities that should be allowed in the areas are asked in sections C and D. See section 7.2 in RIS/PBT for discussion.

	Square area:	Round area:	Round area:	
Flat Rock	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.2 km	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.5 km	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 km	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
Henderson Rock/ Cherubs Cave	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.2 km	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.5 km	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 km	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
China Wall	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.2 km	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.5 km	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 km	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
Gotham City	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.2 km	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.5 km	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 km	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
Wolf Rock	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.2 km (5.7km <sup>2</sup> )	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.5 km (7.1km <sup>2</sup> )	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 km (3.1km <sup>2</sup> )	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)

\* The distances specified are from the central coordinate of the structure to the outside of the square or circle.

Please comment on matters including whether you think a square or circular closure is easier to use, whether there should be different distances for different activities (fishing and/or diving).

Comments:

**Support 1.5 km ideally, as a round zone with distance expressed in nautical miles** – Boundary adjustments that are not seen as detrimental to the grey nurse sharks, but would minimise financial hardship for some stakeholder groups should be made possible. A square closure zone is more difficult to identify on a GPS so consideration should be given to circular closure zones. Distances should be expressed as nautical miles as this is the standard unit of measure for boating.



**Section D Diving activities**

**Question 8 Do you support or not support Proposal Three (see section 8.3 the RIS/PBT)?**

✓ Support (go to question 10)  don't support (go to question 9)  Don't know/no comment (go to question 10)

Comments:

**Support but with the suggested amendments –**

- The specific restrictions stated for dive operators and dive clubs should be extended to all divers, including those diving from private boats;
- The dive group limit should be raised to 12. A limit of 12 is based on the average capacity for a standard day boat dive operation;
- Permanent mooring should be considered on heavily utilised dive sites such as Flat Rock so as to eliminate anchor and chain impacts to the reef but this also could be used to regulate the number of boats allowed to use the site at any point in time. The number of moorings should be proportional to the actual use of the site.

Over the last three years, the diving community has been very supportive in adopting and abiding by the voluntary GNS diving code of conduct. Implementation of the proposed legislation formalises the existing voluntary local diving practices in minimising impacts to the grey nurse sharks.

**Question 9 If you do not support proposal three, indicate which diving alternative you support for each aggregation site (see section 10 of the RIS/PBT).**





# INSTRUCTIONS FOR POSTING

Please fold all the sheets of the completed response form as indicated below. Once folded, tape edges together. Place stamp where indicated, and post. Allow posting time to be sure the Queensland Fisheries Service receives the response by 5pm on Monday 17 November 2003.

**FOLD 1**



**FOLD 2**



**AFFIX  
STAMP  
HERE**

Grey Nurse Shark Joint RIS/PBT  
Queensland Fisheries Service  
Department of Primary Industries  
GPO Box 46  
**BRISBANE, Qld 4001**

**FOLD 3**

