

**Queensland Government's War on Wrecks Taskforce**

Gold Coast public consultation session held on 30 November 2018 at 6 Lawson Street, Southport

**SUMMARY POINTS OF THE TOPICS OF DISCUSSION**

Topic	Subject matter issues / problems identified	Suggestions	Comments
Vessel identification – ownership transfer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• seaworthiness checks are not required / no certificate of seaworthiness regime. No regulation of vessel safety for private transactions.</li> <li>• No vessel identification system (BoatSafe or HIN registry to track vessel/parts over its life).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledgement that registration is not proof of ownership and suggested that all boats should be identifiable by a Hull Identification Number. There is a similar program in NSW – BoatSafe and in Mexico (in Mexico there are severe penalties for non-compliance).</li> <li>• Manufacturers could put the HIN on for new boats and existing boats would need to go to a dealer or authorised dealer to put on vessel. BoatSafe in NSW costs around \$90.00. Could implement a system like this in Queensland</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You can sell a boat and not do the same things that you are required to do for a car. Creating a system that doesn't exist now, but creating a system where selling a boat requires a seaworthiness assessment. Some people saying annual assessment and some saying assessment at certain ages of vessel life.</li> </ul>
Disposal options and opportunities – aging vessels, kerbside collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of facilities for responsible boat owners to dispose of vessels responsibly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More information to people on where to go to dispose of vessels responsibly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GCWA announced that MCC at Steiglitz South are embarking on new venture to dispose of vessels.</li> </ul>

Topic	Subject matter issues / problems identified	Suggestions	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for amnesty period for people to step forward and relinquish derelicts for disposal.</li> <li>Government to work and engage with community to work more collaboratively.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsible boat owners on the Gold Coast can take their vessel there to dispose of responsibly.</li> </ul>
Vessel integrity, safety inspections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seaworthiness and maintenance of vessels and moorings not monitored and/or enforcement of compliance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestions around the appropriate timing for seaworthiness inspections. Most comments made linked with registration / ongoing requirement to be seaworthy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General consensus that owners are still responsible for vessels and should be held to account.</li> </ul>
Registration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all vessels require registration. Vessels with an engine less than 3kW are exempt from registration. Should this be the case?</li> <li>One main issue of unregistered vessels is the lack of owner information and/or ability to contact the owner (when vessel is adrift, dragging anchor or when issues arise).</li> <li>Explanation of where registration fees go – into Government's consolidated revenue fund. Expenditure on new marine facilities and infrastructure,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obligation for unattended boats to display a current phone number of the owner/master.</li> <li>Two tiered registration to distinguish between trailerable and non-trailerable vessels.</li> <li>Require everything to be registered / identifiable – even kayaks and canoes, but concern around registration fees (don't want to turn people off boating/using waterways).</li> <li>Link registration to seaworthiness.</li> <li>rather than registration exemption criterion being based on engine size</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"If it's good enough for a crab pot to have name and contact detail requirements, it's good enough for a vessel to have the owner's contact details attached to it".</li> <li>Suggestion that registration/seaworthiness require an annual report to be attached to the vessel based on age or at specific intervals. Here, a suggestion of annual report was made but views differed as annual cost may be restrictive to some vessel owners. Perhaps based on age/size of vessel.</li> </ul>

Topic	Subject matter issues / problems identified	Suggestions	Comments
	<p>maintenance of existing assets far outweighs the revenue collected.</p>	<p>– require every vessel on the water to be registered and base the cost of registration on the cost of the removal.</p>	
<p>Insurance</p> <p>Acknowledgement that insurance is a major issue.</p> <p>Vessels more than 15m are required to have insurance for salvage and pollution clean-up under existing pollution laws. Vessel less than 15m do not have this requirement imposed under legislation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boats in marinas required to have insurance and be able to move at any time.</li> <li>• Not all vessels are able to get insurance – if living aboard moored vessel;</li> <li>• Some owners are shortening vessels to circumvent the insurance requirements (and reducing the safety of the vessel).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion to establish a scheme / levy to go to a fund to help the costs of removing derelict vessels.</li> <li>• More enforcement and compliance activities and making the requirement on the specific individual / owner to obtain a survey report.</li> </ul>	<p>Mixed views on this suggestion as most vessel owners do the right thing and why should people doing the right thing pay for people that do not.</p> <p>More enforcement and compliance activities and making the requirement on the specific individual / owner to obtain a survey report.</p>
<p>Manufacturer's obligations – recyclability?</p>	<p>Some discussion around manufacturer's being involved with HINs (see comments above).</p> <p>Discussion didn't specifically address recyclability in terms of manufacturer's responsibilities.</p>		
<p>Education – cost of boat ownership</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People buying vessels often second hand oblivious of the condition of the vessel and the amount of work and money required to bring the vessel to seaworthy standard.</li> <li>• Lack of education around full life costs of owning a vessel and maintenance involved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More education on activities and costs associated with maintaining vessels to be available.</li> <li>• More information when training/licensing being provided on real costs of ownership (and more skill development around anchoring – how to do it properly).</li> </ul>	

Topic	Subject matter issues / problems identified	Suggestions	Comments
Waterways Management related matters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue surrounding waterways management and the multiple government agencies that have jurisdiction over the same seaway. In Moreton Bay there is Marine Parks, GCWA, MSQ all in one region. The issue about who to contact and deal with for issues needs to be addressed.</li> <li>• Discussion of the process and notification periods for abandoned vessels. Powers to seize vessel after notification period and no owner comes forward.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GCWA's CEO agreed that there is a complex governance arrangement due to the nature of the agencies' purpose and objects and GCWA was established in 2012 to bring agencies together and close the gap for expectations for the community. The GCWA have recently published "Who's who in the Blue" (available on GCWA's website) to provide information about government agencies areas of responsibilities.</li> <li>• MSQ's Acting General Manager added that steps are being taken to improve the relationship across government agencies, to work more collaboratively together to address issues and in responding to community needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More moorings available to general public for short term / long term use.</li> <li>• Use of environmentally friendly moorings is more expensive but builds capacity into the system. Show of hands. Consensus was that people would be willing to pay more for environmentally friendly moorings if it meant that people weren't anchoring in areas they shouldn't be and/or there was a reduction in vessels anchoring in areas for long periods of time.</li> <li>• Maintenance and self-verification of mooring not good enough. Requirement should be to have people dive on the mooring and produce a report either annually or bi-annually to ensure condition of mooring.</li> <li>• Some comments around noise and amenity issues being a concern for vessels on moorings and not monitored enough.</li> <li>• A general comment that Gold Coast waterways underutilise moorings –</li> </ul>

Topic	Subject matter issues / problems identified	Suggestions	Comments
			there needs to be more as well as facilities for liveaboards.
Liveaboards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should there be a permit system for liveaboards?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consensus was that there should be a permit system for liveaboards and facilities available.</li> <li>Potential for a registered log book that should be provided/inspected for sewage discharges – to apply to everyone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anchorage laws particularly for liveboard vessels are too lenient.</li> <li>Guidelines are not really that relevant and not really enforced. One nautical mile is not far enough for the movement of the vessel within the existing requirement – needs to be farther.</li> </ul>
General Comments	<p>Question: discussion has focused on registration and other issues and funding available, but what is being done to enforce the guidelines / laws around anchorage? Response: GCWA's CEO advised that GCWA conducted 9,200 monitoring activities per month out of approximately 35,000 vessels in Gold Coast waters. The CEO proposed the use of drones as a possible enforcement measure and asked for comments. The response clearly indicated the community wants more enforcement activities and consensus was that drones would be an acceptable use. Comments also made that traffic cameras / CCTV should also be used.</p>		