

Western Australian Mooring Association (WAMA)

(Incorporation Application Lodged)

WAMA SURVEY

for

Recreational Mooring Owners and Authorised Users

Undertaken during Dec 2015 and January 2016

Survey Responses

WAMA SURVEY

for

Recreational Mooring Owners and Authorised Users

Responses were submitted once only per Mooring Owner or Authorised User (Dec 2015/Jan 2016)

INSTRUCTIONS for PARTICIPANTS:

Participants were required to answer all questions.

Written responses were optional except for Questions 1 and 6.

PARTICIPANT PERSONAL INFORMATION and or IDENTIFICATION IS NOT RECORDED.

In WAMA's 'Submission in response to the WA Department of Transport's Moorings Management Position Paper October 2015' dated 20th November 2015, WAMA advised that it was undertaking a survey of recreational mooring owners in respect to the DoT proposals put forward during the Mooring Regulation Streamline Review. The following shows the structure of the responses to the WAMA Survey. A complete analysis of the results and a discussion of their relationship to the Department of Transport Mooring Regulation Streamline Review proposals will be published soon.

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Various statistical publications were consulted to determine the accuracy of this survey and the required response level. With an estimated population of 1,600 to 1,800 registered recreational mooring owners a response level numbering 62 to 65 will be required for a Confidence Level of 90% and a Margin of Error of 10%. The response level on closing this survey totalled 64. This response is statistically considered as a good response that is fair, reasonable and appropriate for this type of survey.

Survey respondents could only access the survey on WAMA's website by way of a password which was forwarded to individual respondents by the WAMA Office on request. Personal information of respondents was not recorded. All respondents were recreational mooring owners and/or authorised recreational mooring users within Western Australia. Individual respondents could only enter the survey once. It was not a requirement to be a WAMA member to participate in the survey.

Respondent structure:

- 71% were Mooring Licensees (Swan and Canning)
- 68% were Mooring Registration Owners (Mangles Bay)
- 44% were Authorised Users
- 13% owned moorings in regional areas.

Some of the respondents were Licensees **and or** Registration Owners **and or** Authorised Users (*This detail is available if required.*) Term of ownership: WAMA Survey Q9. How long have you owned your mooring site? (**Years**)

	Average	Median
Total (All areas)	7.0	4.0
Swan and Canning	6.5	4.0
Mangles Bay	6.7	4.0
Elsewhere	11.6	10.0

It is obvious from the response to the ownership term question that the respondents were mostly very experienced long term mooring apparatus owners.

RESPONSES (Following the format of the Survey Question Sheet.)

1. In which Town or Suburb do you live? (Answer required.)

Mt Claremont; Rockingham; Beeliar; Leda; Rockingham; Palmyra; Nedlands; North Fremantle; Wattleup; Claremont; Rossmoyne; Kelmscott; North Fremantle; Mt Pleasant; Perth; Fremantle; Mandurah; East Victoria Park; Safety Bay; Waikiki; Halls Head; Mosman Park; Rockingham; Kelmscott; Como; Rockingham; Karrinyup; Ballajura; Rockingham; *Jandakot*; Claremont; Rockingham; Wellard; Rockingham; East Fremantle; Rockingham; Cottesloe; Mosman Park; Chidley; Rockingham; Parkwood; Dianella; Perth; Warnbro; Waikiki; Albany; Dunsborough; Dunsborough; Mosman Park; *Safety Bay*; Perth; Rockingham; Mount Lawley; Nedlands; Perth; Belmont; Rockingham; Applecross; Bicton; Tuart Hill; Bull Creek; Beaconsfield; Baldivis South Fremantle.

2. Are you the **Licensee** of a Mooring Site Licence? (Swan and Canning Rivers)

(Note: For question 2, 3, 4 & 5 one response was from a past mooring owner hence total is 63.)

YES	NO
71%	29%
45	18

3. Are you the **Registered Owner** of a Mooring Site? (Mangles Bay or elsewhere)

YES	NO
68%	32%
43	20

4. Are you an **Authorised User** in the Swan, Canning, Mangles Bay?

YES	NO
44%	56%
28	35

5. Do you own a mooring site elsewhere in the State? (Not including Rottneest or Garden Island.)

YES	NO
13%	87%
8	55

6. What is the specific location of your mooring site? (Answer required.)

Swan and Canning	34
Mangles Bay	24
Elsewhere	5

7. What is the maximum swing length of your mooring? (Metres)

	Average	Median	Longest	Shortest
Swan and Canning	11.0	10.0	30	5
Mangles Bay	11.6	12.0	20	5
Elsewhere	13.3	12.0	20	9

8. What is the registered hull length of your Boat? (Metres)

	Average	Median	Longest	Shortest
Swan and Canning	9.2	9.0	20	3
Mangles Bay	8.9	8.5	14	6
Elsewhere	9.8	8.0	20	3

9. How long have you owned your mooring site? (Years)

	Average	Median
Total (All areas)	7.0	4.0
Swan and Canning	6.5	4.0
Mangles Bay	6.7	4.0
Elsewhere	11.6	10.0

10. Are you happy with the current form of the mooring regulations?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
40	16	8	64	63%	25%	13%

11. Are you happy with the way the current mooring regulations are managed by the DoT?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
25	25	14	64	39%	39%	22%

12. Have you had any problems in dealing with the DoT Mooring Office?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
14	50	0	64	22%	78%	0%

13. Are you satisfied with the service you receive from the Mooring Office?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
46	18	0	64	72%	28%	0%

14. Do you see a need for radical changes to the Mooring Regulations 1998?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
6	54	4	64	9%	84%	6%

15. Do you see a need for radical changes to the Shipping and Pilotage (MCA) Regulations 1983?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
3	40	21	64	5%	63%	33%

16. What are the main changes, if any, that you would like to see made to either of the regulation sets?

Mooring fee to be capped; No casual users; Make Swan and Mangles Bay the same regs; Make mooring transfer easier; No changes ; The right to sublet and control who uses my mooring; If it ain't broke - don't fix it; Right of spouse to inherit MSL; Right to sell apparatus at market value and transfer MSL; Boats to be fined for pulling up at a mooring in reverse to check the strength; One set of regs for all - use mooring regulations 1998; Protect the interests of the current mooring holders which have a private asset subject to government regulation but significant private expenditure; Old mooring regs okay; NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, JUST BETTER MANAGEMENT BY DoT WITH A MORE FRIENDLY APPROACH, WE ARE NOT THEIR ENEMY, WE ARE A CUSTOMER; Transfer of mooring to a new owner should be a straightforward, non complicated process; All moorings should be under the control of the Mooring Office including Garden Island and Rottnest; Nil; To be able to sell our mooring to whoever we want; The policing of boats hanging on moorings not suited to the boat size. It seems anyone's right to pick up a mooring without any regard to - if a boat picks up a mooring then that mooring can accommodate that size boat without damage to the mooring and gear; Would not mind other users using and sharing costs as long as I could contact them and have control. I do not support uncontrolled use; Leave them exactly like they are; To be able to sell mooring on open market when required not thru DoT; No change; Cheaper mooring fee; Moorings at cost of licensee...should be freehold, we have to pay all costs. We should be able to have any vessel within mooring limits at "our/licensee " discretion! I have "upgraded " mooring PLUS fittings , in excess of that purchased !; Free market buy/sell of mooring licences; The current Regulations (1998) as applied prior to December 2010 worked very well indeed, I had no issues or problems at that time. I would like to revert to using the existing regulations as applied prior to Dec 2010 as they were intended to be used; Ability to advertise, buy and sell a mooring; As the Licensee of a mooring site, I should not have to also register as an authorised user, and pay a fee, when I leave a runabout, that I use to access my vessel, on the mooring. Even though the runabout does not meet the criteria as a tender, it is still registered to me, the Licensee.

17. What do you think is the approximate value or worth of your mooring site?

	Average	Median	Rate per Metre of Maximum Swing	Highest	Lowest
Total (All areas)	\$8,844	\$7,000			
Swan and Canning	\$11,409	\$10,000	\$1,037	\$20,000	\$5,000
Mangles Bay	\$6,043	\$5,000	\$516	\$10,000	\$3,000
Elsewhere	\$4,800	\$5,000	\$381	\$15,000	\$1,000

18. Did you personally have your mooring apparatus installed?

YES	NO	Total	YES	NO
27	37	64	42%	58%

19. Did you purchase an existing apparatus?

YES	NO	Total	YES	NO
44	20	64	69%	31%

20. In total how much do you think you would spend on your mooring site annually including annual fees, mooring inspection reports, maintenance by contractors or yourself?

	Average	Median	Highest	Lowest
Total (All areas)	\$1,009	\$1,000	\$3,000	\$500
Swan and Canning	\$1,109	\$1,000	\$1,500	\$700
Mangles Bay	\$940	\$800	\$2,000	\$500
Elsewhere	\$660	\$800	\$1,000	\$500

21. How many months of the year would you use your mooring site?

Average	Median	Highest	Lowest
8.5	10.0	12.0	1.0

22. Do you have any authorised vessels registered to your mooring site?

YES	NO	Total	YES	NO
35	28	63	56%	44%

23. If you do or were to allow others to use your site what would be a fair and reasonable contribution to your costs to cover wear and tear to your apparatus etc.? (per month)

Per Month	Average	Median	Highest	Lowest
Total (All areas)	\$134	\$100	\$500	\$50
Swan and Canning	\$120	\$100	\$250	\$50
Mangles Bay	\$139	\$100	\$500	\$50
Elsewhere	\$205	\$200	\$500	\$75

24. Have you ever had any trouble with unauthorised users of your mooring site?

YES	NO	Total	YES	NO
29	35	64	45%	55%

25. If yes, what type of 'trouble' have you had with your mooring site?

Unauthorised us; None; The expense and Stolen bridle; 12M vessel on my mooring when I returned from Rotto; Would not get off; Run over mooring damaging it; Damage to ropes; Large boats parking on unsuitable moorings - stealing due to lack of reasonable policing by the government who charge a fee - other boats being put on my mooring if it is vacant and the govt mooring people telling me it is my responsibility to remove that vessel; Not nasty trouble, but have had to ask a vessel owner to move so I could go onto my own mooring; Returning after a day out and having to get the user to move; Unauthorised use during the day on holiday and long weekends. Once occasion two boats rafted up on the mooring, up to a dozen people consuming alcohol. Unauthorised use has occurred about six times over the years; Nil; Unauthorised persons on my mooring and some with over the registered size boat on the mooring refusing to leave; OTHER NEARBY MOORINGS, OUT OF THEIR REGISTERED POSITION ENCROACHING INTO MY SWING AREA. I CONTACTED DOT TO HELP RECTIFY THIS, THEIR RESPONSE WAS FOR ME AT MY COST TO HAVE ALL 5 ADJACENT MOORINGS POSITIONS GPS CHECKED (\$50 PER MOORING = \$250) I FOUND MY MOORING WAS OUT OF POSITION AS WELL AND HAD IT CORRECTLY REPOSITIONED. REPOSITIONING OF THE OTHER MOORINGS NEVER HAPPENED AND DOT HAVE NEVER CONTACTED ME AS A FOLLOW UP TO CONFIRM THAT THE PROBLEM HAD BEEN RESOLVED. THAT WAS 2004 AND STILL NOT RESOLVED; No trouble, just unauthorised users on it which is OK, but occasionally the unauthorised boat is larger than allowed for that mooring; Refusal to move vessel on my return from Rotto, Very large vessel on my mooring on another occasion (42 foot); Stealing bridles and damaging and having to move them on with difficulty; On returning to the mooring there was a 15m boat on the mooring and was reluctant to move. The tackle on my mooring is not set up for a boat that size; Boats using my mooring for weeks at a time, unable to contact owners and therefore unable to use my own mooring without personally moving someone else boat; Aggressive response to asking people to move on; Other boat users on mooring and refusing to get off. Mooring ropes driven over and cut. Mooring apparatus Yellow float hit, damaged and sunk to the bottom; Unauthorized use, had to request DoT TO REMOVE VESSEL; Boats tied off unattended (6), boats too big for site (45' 15t) head rope and buoys missing, Non attendance of water police and DOT when we need them. Phoned water police 6 times got 2 good responses (its not their job its DoT's. It took one week to get a boat off our mooring tied up there when we went on leave. We often go to mooring late after dinner and we never know what drama to expect. Dot can't be contacted or attend after normal business hours when 95% of the problems occur. They are also way to far away from the action for timely response. How they expect to police a casual usage system is beyond us. The fact is they cant and won't and it will be a shambles. I must point out that my wife actually is the licensee and I am submitting this on her behalf. (She is much younger than I am so if I peg out she will still be able to use the mooring without having to jump thro hoops!! We have taken the head rope off our mooring and this helps a lot; Damaged ropes and excessive wear on chains; Unauthorized

user wouldn't get off the mooring; Mooring interfered with by adjacent mooring owner (Commercial Whale Watching) to make more swing room for a larger boat; Oversize vessel use dragging; Other boats using it; People refusing to leave my mooring when wishing to moor; Tied up to mooring and not near boat; Unauthorised vessel using my mooring; On Australia Day 2015 an unauthorised boat was left unattended on my mooring. I informed the DOT after a few days when it was not removed. I continually contacted the DOT to have this boat removed as I needed to put my permanently stored boat back on the mooring. Despite their best efforts, the DoT took nearly three weeks to have the illegal boat removed. In the meantime I continued to pay temporary pen fees at EFYC.

26. Have you ever been required to contact DoT inspectors to have an unauthorised vessel removed from your mooring site?

YES	NO	Total	YES	NO
12	52	64	19%	81%

27. What other problems have you had with your mooring site or apparatus?

Attitude of Mooring Office Staff; Mussel growth; Numbers peeling off; None; Nothing so far; (Unauthorised) People having loud parties disturbing neighbours; Stolen float and ropes; Other boats using it; The government saying there as worthless even though significant cost are incurred per annum - intimidation by the government mooring people; My mooring is registered with Parks and Wildlife but I have had trouble contacting the ranger of the Shoalwater Marine Park when unauthorised use occurs. Not controlled by DoT; DAMAGE TO MOORING LINES, AND DRAGGING IT OUT OF ITS REGISTERED POSITION; Over charging by DOT for Rental of seabed; Boat on adjoining mooring site is in poor condition and does not react to wind/tide conditions of other boats and occasionally collides with my boat causing damage; DOT did nothing to assist me; Larger boats hooking up and moving and damaging mooring, bridles damaged or stolen; Bigger boats rafting and damaging my gear; When calling DOT for HELP there was No answer on a Sunday; NONE AS THIS MOORING IS CHECKED REGULARLY; Can't think of any - I don't want any more than the above (See *Boats tied off unattended ... this helps a lot*); People damaging the apparatus ropes and floats; When vessel was out of water, part of mooring disappeared; Other boats being moored too close; Accessing it since dinghies no longer allowed on foreshore; The solution that I offered in the first place and could have avoided a lot of grief. I lost a lot of faith in the DOT as they did not really seem to care and showed a complete lack of common sense during the whole process; NIL.

28. Do you support the concept of a waiting list being introduced by the DoT to control the transfer of mooring site licences and registered mooring sites?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
5	52	6	63	8%	83%	10%

29. Do you agree that the DoT should nominate buyers for your mooring apparatus?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
3	54	7	64	5%	84%	11%

30. Do you wish to retain the ability to transfer your mooring site along with the sale of your current licensed vessel?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
60	3	1	64	94%	5%	2%

31. Do you want the ability to transfer your mooring site to a buyer of your mooring apparatus, without the sale of your current licensed vessel, reinstated as it was prior to Dec 2010?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
59	2	3	64	92%	3%	5%

32. Do you wish to retain the ability to nominate authorised users for your site?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
62	0	2	64	97%	0%	3%

33. Do you think that the DoT should create a system of rental moorings that will be solely operated by the DoT?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
23	29	12	64	36%	45%	19%

34. Do you think more Swan River Trust courtesy moorings should be established in the Swan and Canning Rivers?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
46	3	15	64	72%	5%	23%

35. Will you cooperate with a system of casual use of recreational moorings that will allow any boat owner, subject to boat length, the use your private mooring apparatus - free?

YES	NO	NEUTRAL	Total	YES	NO	NEUTRAL
4	53	7	64	6%	83%	11%

36. What problems do you see with a system of free casual use being implemented over all privately owned recreational moorings?

Q36 ANSWERS:

(Individual answers are separated by a semi-colon - ;)

Damage; Insurance; Damage; Casual Use; Insurance; No rapid response (for trouble) by DoT does not happen; No interest; Inconvenience; damage to bridles and tackle; Insurance; Boats too large; damage to mooring; This will not work without the owner giving specific approval to the user; Everything from damage, stolen rigging, extra fees for management. People leaving vessel and many more; Damaging moorings esp. at night when dark; Damage; conflict; in-experienced users; theft; Damage, not being able to tie up after a day out; The government should pay the mooring owner a fee. Who will supervise it? Who will pay for damage to the mooring? Who will pay for the costs?; 1. Damage to my mooring apparatus; 2. Having to ask people to remove themselves from my mooring so I can get onto it. 3. Increase in DoT fees; Mooring rage ,damage to mooring gear, insurance issues; Damage to apparatus; No control over the use of my mooring; Physical and verbal abuse when asked to vacate mooring; Unauthorised damage with no repair or method to find the culprit. Inconvenience of discovering my damaged mooring just when I want to use it, or even worse, not discovering the damage until your boat breaks free and causes others and itself unforetold damage; Damage and maintenance problems with the apparatus; Damage to mooring and ropes, People staying overnight illegally and leaving their vessel on mooring with no one on-board. When mooring fails who will be held responsible if others have used it and damage is not evident? How will owners get remunerated by DoT for the casual use of their mooring?; MY LEGAL LIABILITY. DOT'S LEGAL LIABILITY RENTING OUT MY MOORING APPARATUS BY WAY OF PAYING DOT AN ANNUAL FEE. CONFLICT WITH OTHER BOAT OWNERS WHEN I NEED TO PUT MY BOAT BACK ON THE MOORING. DAMAGE TO MY MOORING LINES AND DRAGGING IT OUT OF POSITION *problems are* ENDLESS;

Damage to my apparatus with no payment to me to fix it; Incorrect use of the mooring, damage to the mooring, inconvenience to the mooring owner in having to get someone off the mooring when returning to the mooring. Liability/responsibility for any mooring damage. History suggests that if damage occurs to the mooring that those responsible will not come forward. I have recently had damage to my boat on the mooring by another boat. This was a "hit and run" incident requiring approx. \$30000 repair work. There is no reason to assume that those who may damage a mooring will not adopt a similar attitude; The casual users will invariably not be on the boat when I arrive to use my mooring. As in the past, there is a great likelihood that the casual user will attach a boat too large for the rated gear; The mooring apparatus is my property and it is my decision to who uses it. Damage to my mooring. People not leaving when come back to mooring; Insurance, damage to gear, refusal to move vessel *etc*; Damage and not being available to myself. People will just hook up and stay for free, no control of the mooring I own and pay for; Damage to the mooring and a boat *tying* up to your mooring that is too big and heavy causing damage; Damage to moorings, inconvenience to the mooring owner, insurance problems with uninsured boats on moorings and invisible damage being done to them; Increase in the current problems of uncontrolled use of a mooring I care for and maintain at a cost to me and at no cost or regard from them; If the mooring is damaged who pays for the repair or just the additional wear?; Damage! And the means of..Eg coming back from Rotto (a holiday destination) and not being able to pull up to my mooring.. because a boat is on it; Not being able to have use of my mooring if a casual vessel is on my mooring, damage to mooring running gear, just do not want casual vessels using my mooring; Much increase in maintenance, litigation arising from misuse and damage by users, massive increase in misuse and illegal use, refusal to leave by tipsy crews who wont believe you own the mooring. Abject failure by DOT to have the means or the will to police it adequately; Why should someone be able to use free of charge when I pay to keep it safe and secure. How do you establish fault if the mooring is damaged or insecure; Damage to the mooring such that when I want to use it there is a risk to the safety of my boat and occupants, I need to know *the level of* its use so I can engage the appropriate maintenance; Usage cannot be policed. Any damage would be at my expense to repair. Unknown stress on apparatus means never knowing for sure how secure my vessel is. My insurer may decline a claim if unknown users could have caused damage; Damages to the mooring and who is going to pay for the repairs; People not abiding by correct size boats on moorings. Problem of people leaving boats on moorings unattended. Legal responsibility for damage caused and the consequences of this; I am likely to return to my mooring and find it in use by another vessel. Note; My mooring at Quindalup is where my boat is normally kept for 7 months of the year; Many problems of damage property and safety as well as inability to store my boat; Damage; People refusing to leave when I wish to moor, damage to the apparatus; Major conflict & DAMAGE to vessels AND MOORINGS possibly & probable physical , personal , LEGAL conflict between persons MORE bureaucratic interference AND increased costs; We have paid for the mooring and up-keep; Access, maintenance, insurance cost and public and third party liabilities; Rafferty's rules, damage to moorings, wrong size vessels on moorings. Who will police casual use? Who bears the cost of damage to my mooring etc. All these problems have been discussed at previous meetings with DoT; Policing will be impossible. Damage to mooring apparatus and surrounding vessels; There will definitely be breaches of the rules by casual users. The DOT do not have the resources to police the casual use system. It will add an element of stress to owners of stored boats. Casual users may often be reluctant to move when asked to do so and aggressive situations will arise. Involving authorities will only heighten the stress. Boat owners I have talked to are also worried about "payback" vandalism to their boats when they are left vulnerable on the mooring. The enjoyment of a Sunday afternoon run up the river will be lost. Casual boats being left unattended will also be a major problem for owners of permanently stored boats. There are many other issues regarding additional maintenance, inspections and insurance which have not been addressed by the DOT; It's a rip off, as per Rottnest where a money grabbing exercise exists making the government \$ 4,000,000 a year; 1. Wear & tear with the use of mooring should be paid for by casual user. 2. D.O.T should provide 'user' the contact details of

owner. 3. User should be 'on board' during the 'casual' use. Owner pays - Owner has freedom of use. I don't want to go to my mooring, find someone using it who I have to then ask to leave, especially if I am sailing at my mooring, solo and have the surprise of a boat being tied up and having to navigate that, and ask them to move. It would be a very problematic occurrence.

37. Please place any other comments about the DoT Mooring Regulation Review hereunder:

Q37 ANSWERS:

(Individual answers are separated by a semi-colon - ;)

Leave as status quo; Mooring for my use only; Retain the right to sell privately; Proposed changes by DoT are not 'fair and equitable'; Fixed keel yachts will become unsaleable if mooring cannot be transferred; We know they (DoT) intend to take over; DoT not considering owners concerns at all; DoT should answer owners concerns; I think DOT are out of touch with the current boating owners in this state; The government is stealing a private asset; I don't think it is a review, I think they have their own mandate; I am worried that DoT will introduce proposed changes even though there might be strong opposition from DoT mooring licence owners and the DoT system might extend to other areas currently outside their control; Would the DOT replace a mooring if the mooring is damaged by casual users?; Where does the liability sit with this? Will the DoT want to be liable for injury, death or damage due to its own policy fault?; I believe we should keep the current system, and only use the casual system for Rottneest Island and areas of popular day trip destination; THERE IS AN OLD SAYING,,, "IF IT AIN'T BROKE THEN DON'T TRY AND FIX IT". DOT'S PROPOSAL SOUNDS GREAT, BUT IT IS ANYTHING BUT. DOT NEED TO MANAGE THE EXISTING REGULATIONS MORE PROFESSIONALLY WITH A MORE FRIENDLY AND LESS THREATENING APPROACH TO MOORING SITE OWNERS. WE ARE NOT THEIR ENEMY AND ARE LEGAL MOORING SITE OWNERS ONLY BECAUSE THE REGULATIONS EXIST. FROM MY OBSERVATIONS, CASUAL USE OF MOORINGS ALREADY HAPPENS DAILY AND DOTS ABILITY TO MANAGE THIS IS LIMITED BY IT'S LOW NUMBERS OF ON WATER VESSELS, THEY SIMPLY DON'T HAVE THE INFRASTRUCTURE OR STAFFING; If it ain't broke, why stuff around with the system?; There seems to be less consideration of the views of existing mooring owners than those wanting access to a mooring site. However, mooring sites that have been vacant for more than 5 years would appear to be a wasted resource. There needs to be some system whereby vacant sites can be managed and perhaps made available to more boating owners. The owner of the site should receive some compensation for this as well as having the right to have the mooring revert to his use if and when required. My mooring is an expensive asset and no government department should have the right to arbitrarily take it; I feel the Dept. is not listening to the rightful owners of the mooring apparatus, and I believe they have no intention of listening to my concerns. When this "review" was first put forward, we were advised that existing mooring owners that used mooring for storage would be impacted minimally, what a load of rubbish we were fed; I think the mooring owner should have a say in who can hook up to his mooring and if the boat is in compliance to the mooring it should have no problems with DoT they are getting there licence money. The system of transfer needs simplifying; The *cost* we pay *to DoT* for a mooring is way to much, we should be able to do what we like with our own mooring. If we want to sell our mooring it should be up to us and sell to recover our costs of up keep; I do not want to loose the value of the asset that I have; This review up until recently appears to have a *pre-empted* and loaded outcome and does not take into regard that people have cared for and maintained moorings at great cost to themselves for many years; I paid a considerable amount of money for my mooring under the understanding it is then my asset, I don't want the system changed if I can't sell the mooring when and to who I want, if I cant, I feel I should be entitled to compensation to at least the full amount that I paid; *The* management of the mooring system *should* stay the same as it is but with the inclusion of free short term use of vacant moorings, provided that a skipper remained onboard to move a vessel at the request of authorised users; I think the Shared mooring system for Rotto is

working O.K. But! with a lot of Damage to mooring Apparatus, I think some reduction of fees for repair should be paid by DOT to repair these moorings. Dot is receiving a lot of money for the use of these moorings with a shared mooring system. The ONLY one that's paying for the repairs on the mooring are the owners. They are slowly losing all their rights; Do not like them, status quo is what I would like to see; I think it should be scrapped and the pre 2010 situation restored. I would however support a limited casual use system as proposed by WAMA if it could be adequately policed because I think that this is a big driver of this review given that there is probably loud minority screaming for it; I do not see any reason why a capped price / sale structure could not be set up for various size moorings and locations which is fair and allows for costs to be recovered - less reliance on the Mooring office to police and approve; I don't keep a mooring bridle on my moorings, I keep it on the boat so others don't use the mooring, I don't intend to put a mooring bridle on all my moorings. Damage to the mooring without my knowledge is a concern. I paid good money for my moorings and if I don't need them any more I expect that I should be able to recover this investment. I also spend good money on maintenance for my use only; Before targeting every mooring in the state, DoT should address what is currently in their control and remove derelict boats from moorings, and put in more DoT managed moorings for general public use. If my mooring has to be used by unknown vessels then there needs to be a maintenance cost sharing system. I'm happy to pay for the 2 year inspection and replacements at that time however, anything else prior to the 2 years is at DoT's cost. My annual fee also ought to be subsidised; The review failed to get input from boat owners, before they fabricated questions that did not cover all aspects required and therefore DoT's claimed "mandate" is simply not valid; Exceptionally bad idea. Not acceptable by any means. Will remove my mooring; Can this really be legal, for a government to just takeover a private asset and rent/ lease it out without the owners consent?; NO CHANGE and reduce mooring fee's; DOT should be releasing more mooring sites to be paid for by new owners. Moorings should be allowed to be lengthened to take bigger vessels. NEW YACHT CLUB established at Alfred Cove / Attadale off Burke Drive South of Perth Yacht Club to establish MORE JETTIES &/or their adjacent areas to be made available for PRIVATE MOORINGS..!! DOT to be involved in SAFETY not MOORINGS..!!; A free market system is best; The impression is that DOT don't care about the existing mooring owners and are just trying to justify their own existence; *The DoT Survey* is misleading, unfair and full of "loaded" questions. Most importantly it is unnecessary. DoT are pretending to fix a problem (occupancy) they created, by restricting free market buy/sell of licences; The DOT review to date has ignored the input from mooring licensees and users. It is obvious that the DOT has not altered its stance since the review process began. This brings into question the legitimacy of the whole review process; I don't agree with any changes to the regulations and believe there is no necessity for a review. Everything has worked well prior to 2009; Moorings need to be able to be sold with the authorised vessel if need be *and after a licensed vessel sale moorings should be able to be retained by the mooring owner for a period of one year and can be sold at market value - within that period and if not sold can then be removed - wherein the 'site' reverts back to DoT.* *The Mooring Regulations 1998* used to work just fine. Mooring owners respect the privilege of ownership and manage the use well. I'm disappointed that when dinghy's were removed no storage solution was put in place. That's what hampers usage!

Is the Department of Transport using proper rationale and factual information to support the proposals being put forward in the Mooring Regulation Streamline Review?

You be the judge.

WAMA Office

(See the Survey Analysis)

(c) Western Australian Mooring Association (WAMA) (Incorporation Application Lodged)
February 2015