

# Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill 2026

**Submission No:** 088

**Submission By:** [REDACTED]

**Publication:** Making the submission public but withholding your name

---

## **Submission for Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill 2026**

1. Noosa must have a representative on the Board
2. MSQ must be allowed to finish the implementation of new anchoring and mooring rules, fought for by the community in Noosa
3. Gold Coast Authority not successful at managing anchoring and mooring, so do NOT copy it
4. Include First Nations - why not consulted?

### Notes:

1. I watched your briefing meeting with interest. Although you state you consulted with local and state government officials, it seems at local level this is not the case as neither our Noosa Mayor nor MP were consulted.

Of all the rivers in the SC group, Noosa is perhaps the most contentious so surely demands a representation on the Board where decisions will be made. It is of deep concern that Noosa has not been consulted (well at least publicly) nor represented on the Board.

2. Noosa is currently going through the most upheaval to respond to the growing pressures of population growth and all the pressures that go with it. This includes the unofficial live-aboard population growing, increased recreational boating and fishing pressures.

How will this new approach affect measures that are currently being rolled out by MSQ?

The community came together to find a solution with the MSQ steering the actions now being implemented. Not everyone is happy with it but for once, opposing parties agreed that 28 days and then leave was the only way to reduce vessels being dumped on the Noosa river system.

Unlike other more 'metropolitan' Sunshine Coast areas, Noosa has two very vocal groups – one fighting for the environment and the other for the rights of recreational boaters. I know this because I was on the NRSAC committee who worked on this. It is difficult to get a fair picture of what's going on, so a new authority will need to be careful how they navigate this. Note this committee had representatives from all areas – commercial, rec boaters, environmental and other interested parties, something essential for future actions in my opinion.

3. During our committee discussions, the Gold Coast Waterways Authority was a model quoted as NOT to be followed as they were unable to contain the growth and administration of vessels moving around the system. Even when they had an on-water presence of their own to manage it.

In your briefing, the simple description of 'above and below the waterways' was used to describe the division of responsibility with MSQ.

Where then does anchoring and mooring of an illegal vessel sit? Please don't kick it under the table because I have the feeling the focus for attention and investment is clearly on dredging for safety in other parts of the system.

MSQ has already sorted out Maroochy, Mooloola and Pumicestone Passage anchoring and mooring rules.

We need to finish what has been started up here, or we will be back to the stalemate of a decade ago. I would like to see the completion of this MSQ process, by all means overseen by the new Authority. Then at least all of the involved waterways will be on a level playing field when it comes to vessel anchoring management. It would be a shame to see Noosa back in the 'too hard' basket and a graveyard for dumped vessels.

4. One question was tabled about whether First Nations interests were considered. The answer in the video was "no". Why on earth not? You will need to make provisions sooner or later around Native Title claims on the Sunshine Coast.

Thank you for your consideration.