

3 HOW TO USE THIS PLAN

3.1 Management themes and actions

The issues, conflicts and concerns in the Lake raised by stakeholders during the consultation process have been categorised into the following general management themes:

- water quality and flow
- ecology
- fisheries
- oyster aquaculture
- sedimentation
- foreshore management
- waterway usage
- community education

These management themes provide the basis for the action plans in section 4.

3.2 Priority and timing

Each management strategy in the action plans has been designated a rank based on the following priority assessment scheme.

TEMPORAL AND/OR SPATIAL SCALE		CONSEQUENCE				
		1	2	3	4	5
		Catastrophic	Major	Moderate	Minor	Insignificant
A	Always / Entire estuary	I	I	I	H	H
B	Often / >1 Management Area	I	I	H	H	M
C	Regularly / Single Management Area	I	H	H	M	M
D	Occasionally / Localised	H	H	M	M	L
E	Rarely / Confined	H	M	M	L	L

I = Immediate priority; H = High priority; M = Medium priority; L = Long-term priority.

[Table 3.1: Priority assessment ranking scheme]

DETERMINATION OF CONSEQUENCE		
1	Catastrophic	Human death and/or huge financial loss and/or irreversible environmental/social/cultural damage or loss
2	Major	Serious human injury and/or major financial loss and/or significant environmental/social/cultural damage or loss
3	Moderate	Human medical treatment required and/or huge financial loss and/or serious environmental/social/cultural damage or loss
4	Minor	Medium financial loss and/or moderate environmental/social/cultural damage or loss
5	Insignificant	Low financial loss and/or some environmental/social/cultural damage or loss

[Table 3.2: Determination of consequence for priority assessment ranking scheme]

This ranking scheme allows highest priority to be given to strategies relating to issues where the current situation is irreversibly threatening the health of the Lake system over large spatial and temporal scales and/or has the potential to cause human death. In this case management measures will bring immediate relief to the environment and benefit the community.

Strategies with the *immediate priority* rank should be implemented within 1 year of adoption of the plan to prevent further degradation/conflict or irreversible damage, *high priority* strategies should be implemented with the next 2-3 years and *medium priority* actions should be implemented within the next 5 years. *Long-term priority* has been given to strategies that will need to be implemented to address issues in the near future, but higher ranked items should take precedence.

Specific time frames are deliberately omitted for each action; instead it is thought it to be inherent in the designated priority rank. This avoids precluding implementation of lesser-ranked actions if the opportunity arises to do so with little investment of resources.

3.3 Indicative costs

Where possible, an approximate budget based on information currently available is presented for implementing each action. The values given will need reviewing when a detailed work program is developed. Maintenance costs associated with the actions and in carrying out the monitoring and reporting program to assess performance are not included in the costing. Actions that require staff time only are indicated.

3.4 Performance assessment

Section 6 details how the performance of the management actions can be monitored, assessed and reviewed where necessary. The authorities responsible for collecting, analysing and archiving the data have been identified.

Reporting to the public will be essential to the success of the overall plan, especially where stakeholders have foregone certain activities to comply with the action. In this case, if the action is successful and benefits to the environment or wider community can be shown, the trade-off made

by the stakeholders will be viewed to be worthwhile. Further, the monitoring and reporting process must be transparent to the public so that the motives for implementing the action are clear.