

PRELIMINARY EXAMPLES

Extracts from submissions received by WAMA from concerned/interested parties:

AUTHOR'S NAMES HAVE BEEN REMOVED FOR PRIVACY REASONS

"I have three moorings in total in the state. Two in Mangles Bay and one in Dongara. Two are in constant use as I have two 50 ft plus boats and one is the mooring left when I go to Dongara or have them both back in Mangles.

I am concerned with the new proposals as at any time I may be shifting from one area to another and of course if I arrive and my mooring is being used what do I do then? With larger boats we need more water and swing so I am limited as to which moorings I can use."

"My wife and I own a Swan River mooring (in her name) in the Peppermint Grove beach area and we are keen to join the Association to strengthen our say in the development of the forthcoming River mooring management plan.

I attended the Point Walter Golf Club meeting held by the Marine Ops presenter and was pleased to find most others at the meeting agreed with my thoughts and disagreed most seriously with some of the key management strategies being proposed. I didn't get a word in but others managed to cover most of what I would have said.

It is quite clear that the Dept. has an agenda they will push to the limit despite what the mooring owners wish and the only way I can see of overturning some their pet ideas is to "politicise" the issues to the point where serious votes will be lost if they proceed. This means forming a strong Lobby group such as WAMA.

BWA (of which I am also a member) should be vocally supporting us but do not seem to be. I believe they are supporting what they believe is a large majority of boat owners who can't get moorings but will allegedly be greatly advantaged by the management plan proposed! I don't believe for one minute the proposals will do much to help those wanting a mooring, mainly because of the Department's crazy views and rules on mooring transfers. A shared mooring system has to be highly policed to work effectively and we all know that is not possible with current resources and the Dept. sure as hell won't get any more funding in the present economic climate. The current level of policing is so inadequate that people are getting away with "murder" and know they can. It would be helpful if mooring neighbours could exchange contact details and so actually help the department police illegal mooring use. However, they are most unhelpful in facilitating this, citing privacy issues and, most importantly will not provide an "out of business hours" contact number when 99% of the transgressions occur. Contacting the Water Police is a waste of time as calls to them largely bring no response. After all it is Marine Ops who are responsible for policing moorings not the police!"

MOORING REVIEW COMMENTS

DoT APPEAR LOCKED IN THAT ROTTNEST HOLIDAY ISLAND MOORING SITUATION IS SAME AS MANGLES BAY /SWAN/ RIVER. NOT SO WE ALL KNOW THAT.

DoT WANT TO UTILIZE OUR MOORING WHEN VACANT BY ALLOWING "CASUAL USE" AS AT ROTTNEST AND CHARGING THE CASUAL USER A RATE FOR DOING THIS EVEN THOUGH THE LESSEE IS PAYING TOP DOLLAR FOR INSTALL .MAINT. AND RENT OF MOORING . THIS IS PROFITEERING OF THE MOST BLATANT TYPE AND YET THEY SAY THE INTENTION IS TO STOP LESSEE FROM PROFITEERING.

MOST MOORINGS IN MANGLES BAY /SWAN ARE NOT HOLIDAY MOORINGS AS AT ROTTNEST (USED OCCASIONLY) BUT PERMANENT AS THERE IS NO OTHER STORAGE.

WE DO NOT WANT TO GO OUT IN VESSEL FOR THE DAY AND FIND THE MOORING TAKEN UP WHEN COMING HOME AFTER A LONG DAY AND FINDING ANOTHER VESSEL TIED UP HAVING TO TRACK DOWN OWNER TO SHIFT. TEMPER CAN GET FRAYED.

THER APPEARS TO BE A LACK OF ANSWERS WHEN THE QUESTION OF NUMBERS OF CASUAL USERS ARE WAITING IN THE WINGS AS ALSO TO THE QUESTION OF HOW MANY PERMANENTS ARE REQUESTED.

DoT PROVIDES A NUMBER OF RED MOORINGS IN ALL AREAS WHICH ARE ALLOWED FOR CASUAL USE (UP TO 72 HOURS) TO ANY ONE WHO WISHES TO UTILISE THEM AND NO FEE CHARGED.....WHY DO THEY WANT TO CHARGE A FEE TO THE CASUAL USER TO USE MOORINGS INSTALLED BY THE PRIVATE PERSON WITHOUT ANY RECOMPENSE TO THAT PERSON.

PERHAPS A SOLUTION SO AS DoT ARE NOT SEEN TO BE PROFITEERING WOULD BE TO ALLOW THE LESSEE OF A MOORING WHO CHOS^SE TO ALLOW CASUAL USE TO OTHERS WHEN THE MOORING IS NOT BEING UTILISED FOR A PERIOD OF TIME DO SO . TO BE A CASUAL USER A VESSEL WOULD BE LICENCED AS SUCH WITH A LABEL AND PHONE NUMBER FOR CONTACT(AS AT ROTTNEST) . THE LESSEE OF THE CASUAL USE MOORING WOULD IN ADDITION TO THE MOORING REG. NUMBER, HAVE THE REG. NUMBER OF THE LESSEE'S VESSEL AND THE WORDS CASUAL USE PAINTED ON THE MOORING ALONG WITH THE SIZE OF VESSEL ALLOWABLE FOR THAT MOORING.

THE LESSEE WOULD STILL HAVE PRIORITY USE OF THE MOORING.

THE CASUAL USER WOULD HAVE TO PAY A FEE TO SATISFY THE DoT BUT THE LESSEE WHO HAS TO BEAR ALL THE INSTALL. AND ONGOING COSTS OF THE MOORING WOULD BE GIVEN A SUBSTANTIAL REDUCTION IN RENT (PERHPS 75%) AS THIS OBVIOUSLY IS MINIMISING THE NUMBER OF RED MOORINGS AND AS SUCH THE COST TO DoT.

I ALSO BELIEVE THAT VESSELSON A PERMANENT MOORING SHOULD BE SEA WORTHY AND BE ABLE TO BE SHIFTED WITH A MINIMUM OF FUSS UNLESS THAT VESSEL IS OBVIOUSLY UNDERGOING REPAIRS OR MAINTENANCE. THERE ARE FAR TOO MANY MOORINGS BEING USED WHERE THE VESSELS ARE DERELICT AND OBVIOUSLY NOT SEAWORTHY AS SUCH AND THESE MOORINGS COULD BE UTILISED TO CLEAR A BACKLOG (IF THERE IS ANY). ONE WONDERS LOOKING AT THE CONDITON OF SOME

continued /page

MOORING/BOATS IN MANGLES BAY /RIVER WHY DoT IS NOT TARGETING THIS PROBLEM IF THEY ARE SO WORRIED ABOUT LACK OF MOORINGS.

WOULD WE NOW FIND THAT IF CASUAL USE WAS ALLOWED THEN OUR FEES WOULD RISE TO PAY FOR THE EXTRA STAFF IN FANCY UNIFORMS AND FLASH NEW BOATS TO POLICE THE NEW REGS.

IF FOR SOME REASON A LESSEE WISES TO BE RELEASED FROM THEIR LEASE THEN THE DoT IF THEY WILL NOT ALLOW TO BE ONSOLD THEN THEY MUST RECOUP THE LESEE ANY REMAINING RENT AND ALSO A PRORATA CONTRIBUTION TO THE COST OF MAINTENANCE.

I HAVE BEEN TOLD THAT AT ROTTNEST THAT IF YOU LEAVE YOUR TENDER ON A MOORING WHILST OUT BOATING, TENDER MUST BE TIED ON IN A MANNER THAT IT CAN BE EASILY UNTIED BY OTHERS WHO WISH TO USE THE MOORINGSURELY THIS IS NOT LEGAL.....INTERFERING WITH ANOTHER PERSONS VESSEL.

THE QUESTION OF SUBLETTING SHOULD BE GIVEN SERIOUS CONSIDERATION WHEREBY A LESSEE CAN SUBLET FOR A PERIOD OF TIME TO ANOTHER AND BE ABLE TO RECOUP A REASONABLE AMOUNT TO RECOUP SOME OF THE COSTS OF MAINTAINING MOORING.

IF A CASUAL USE MOORING IS DAMAGED BY OTHERS OTHER THAN THE LESSEE THEN THE DoT WOULD NEED TO TAKE SOME RESPONSIBILITY IN ASSISTING WITH REPAIRS .

Continuation of 1st Extract:

"I have 3 moorings currently and 2 boats over 50ft. I have 2 in Mangles Bay and one Dongara. The reason for 3 is that at any time I might wish to be in Dongara for say the summer or Mangles for maintenance and general fishing.

With what I understand to be the proposed changes if I am not using a particular mooring for a given length of time it may be reassigned to someone else. My question is if the weather is turning bad in Dongara and I wish to come back to Mangles, what if someone is on my mooring ? As the boats are of a size that stops me from using most moorings, what do I do then?

In the Mangles Bay Fishing Club we have had issues in the past of people borrowing Jinkers to do repairs. I only need it for a week or two is the initial request. When 2 months later the job was bigger than thought the boat incapacitated and you want to use your own Jinker how do you get them off?

I understand there may be some moorings either never used or very seldom but sometimes it may just look that way and there is a reason like mine for it.

I also spend considerable money on keeping my apparatus up to scratch, I don't hear of any recompense in these discussions only administration costs.

In closing with the lack of Marina space and ample room in some places to add to mooring numbers, I would be totally against letting someone just roll up and use my facility."

AUTHOR'S NAMES HAVE BEEN REMOVED FOR PRIVACY REASONS