July 2006

Community Survey 2006

A Study of Attitudes & Awareness of Residents in the Lake Macquarie Catchment

---

Prepared for: The Office of the Lake Macquarie & Catchment Coordinator

Prepared by: FordComm Consulting

Table of Contents

Chapter	***Page***
Executive Summary	
1. Introduction	**1**
2. Methods	**2**
3. Results	**6**
3.1 General issues of concern to local residents	**6**
3.2 Attitudes towards changes in the quality of the environment	**7**
3.3 Importance of various environmental issues	**9**
3.4 Activities and their impact on the environment	**12**
3.5 Recreational usage of Lake Macquarie	**15**
Appendix I Questionnaire used in the Community Survey	
Appendix II Detailed results of the Community Survey by gender, age and work status	
Appendix II General comments made by respondents	

Executive Summary

The Lake Macquarie research project saw 604 residents from the Lake Macquarie catchment area surveyed by telephone. Interviews were conducted in June 2006.

The points below summarise the main findings of the research:

- The community remains positive in its perception of the Lake. When asked to give the current quality of Lake health a rating (1 being poor, 10 being excellent), the community gave a (mean score) of 6.8, a marginal increase on the result from the earlier surveys; 2004 (6.7), 2003 (6.4), 2001 (6.2) and 2000 surveys (6.1).

- The community is also positive about the changes in the quality of the lake environment in the past. When asked whether the state of the Lake has got better, worse or stayed the same in the past five years, 53% of people thought it had improved, 30% said it has remained the same and only 11% said it had got worse. These results have followed an encouraging trend, with the number of people believing the lake has improved increasing every survey period.

- The community is also positive about the future of the Lake. When asked whether the state of the Lake would be better, worse or the same in five years time, 48.5% of people thought it would improve, 23.7% said it would remain the same and 19.9% said it would get worse.

- Treating stormwater before it enters the Lake using devices such as wetlands was considered the best approach to improving the water quality of Lake Macquarie.

1. Introduction

The latest Living Lake Macquarie Survey (July 2006) was commissioned by The Office of the Lake Macquarie & Catchment Coordinator and prepared by FordComm Consulting. The study was a repeat of surveys carried out in April 2000, October 2001, July 2003 and December 2004.

This document presents the results of the telephone survey of approximately 600 residents of the Lake Macquarie catchment area. The aims of the survey were to:

- Obtain information on the issues that concern local residents.
- Obtain information on community attitudes towards and perceptions about the local environment.
- Obtain information about peoples activities and impacts on the environment.
- To provide feedback on a regular basis on community perceptions of the Lake and to map trends.

The methods of data collection and analysis are described in Section 2, and the results are presented in Section 3.

2. Methods Of Data Collection And Analysis

2.1 Data Collection

The following methods were used to collect data from households in Lake Macquarie.

Questionnaire development: The questionnaire used was developed by FordComm Consulting Pty Ltd. A copy is provided in Appendix I.

Survey technique: Telephone interviews.

Period: Interviews were conducted between 29 May – 6 July 2006.

Survey area: Residents living in the Lake Macquarie Catchment (LMC) area were surveyed. A representative suburb listing is provided in Table 1 on the following page.

Sample selection: The sample of households contacted was derived from a random selection of household telephone numbers from the Telstra White Pages directory for postcodes and place names in the LMC area. On the first contact with the selected household the person answering the telephone was asked to confirm that the residence was in the LMC area. If the residence was not in the area the interview did not proceed, and a replacement telephone number was randomly selected.

Respondent selection: The person living in the household aged 18 or over who had the next birthday was selected as the respondent for the household contacted. If the selected household did not answer, the number was engaged, or the required respondent was not available, up to five calls back were made. Where this procedure did not result in a successful interview a replacement telephone number was randomly selected.

Final sample size: 604 completed interviews.

Sample variation: A sample size of 600 yields a sample variation of ±5.8 per cent at a confidence level of 95 per cent, given a response probability of 50 per cent.

In practical terms, this means that if 50 per cent of the randomly selected respondents in the sample answered "yes" in a yes/no question (the result with the highest possible variation in statistical accuracy), the true proportion of the population who would answer "yes" (if all were surveyed) would lie between 44.2 per cent and 55.8 per cent, 95 times out of 100.

Table 1: Suburbs in the Lake Macquarie Catchment

Cameron Park
West Wallsend
Holmesville
Barnsley
Edgeworth
Killingsworth
Glendale
Argenton
Cardiff Heights
Cardiff
Garden Suburb
Macquarie Hills
Cardiff South
Hillsborough
Boolaroo
Charlestown
Gateshead
Mount Hutton
Tingira Heights
Floraville
Belmont North
Belmont
Belmont South
Marks Point
Pelican
Little Pelican
Swansea
Cams Wharf
Croudace Bay
Valentine
Eleebana
Warners Bay
Lakelands
Speers Point
Teralba
Wakefield
Booragul
Marmong Point
Woodrising
Bolton Point
Fennell Bay
Fassifern
Ryhope
Freemans Waterhole
Blackalls Park
Awaba
Toronto
Carey Bay
Coal Point
Kilaben Bay
Rathmines
Fishing Point
Balmoral
Buttaba
Arcadia Vale
Wangi Wangi
Myuna Bay
Eraring
Dora Creek
Cooranbong
Martinsville
Morisset
Mandalong
Bonnells Bay
Yarrawonga Park
Balcolyn
Silverwater
Sunshine
Mirrabooka
Brightwaters
Windermere Park
Morisset Park
Wyee Point
Wyee
Nords Wharf
Summerland Point
Mannering Park
Gwandaln
Chain Valley Bay
Point Wolstoncroft
Crangan Bay
Doyalson North

2.2 Structure of the survey sample

In summary the underlying survey sample comprised of:

- Approximately 59 per cent of respondents were female and 41 percent male.
- Persons aged 65 or over accounted for about 30.5 per cent of respondents, with 5.5 per cent of respondents aged between 18 and 24.
- Retirees and pensioners accounted for 41 per cent of respondents while 27 per cent were engaged in full time work and a further 14 per cent in part-time or casual work
- Approximately 88 per cent of respondents live in a separate house.

These raw results were then "weighted" by the age and sex distribution of the catchment area to ensure consistency with data collected in previous years.

2.3 Cross-tabulations

Results relating to the attitudes and perceptions of residents about the local environment of the Lake Macquarie catchment area were cross-tabulated according to:

- Age
- Sex

Results are also compared to previous surveys.

2.4 Presentation of the results in Section 3

The significant results by age and gender are presented in tabulated form in Appendix II for each consecutive question in the survey.

Open-ended responses were coded under representative headings to enable easier analysis. The *verbatim* responses to the final general open-ended question in the survey are provided in Appendix III.

2.5 Average perception and satisfaction ratings

Respondents were requested to use two scales to rate their satisfaction with or perception of environmental outcomes or amenities. One scale involved the ranking of issues on a scale of:

Poor 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Excellent

Average scores were calculated by assigning the values of 1 to 'Poor' and 10 to 'Excellent', with the other ratings coinciding with their assigned numbers. 'Don't know' responses where excluded from the calculation.

The other scale involved asking respondents to rank against the scale:

Strongly disagree	(1)
Disagree	(2)
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)
Agree	(4)
Strongly agree	(5)

Average agreement ratings were calculated by assigning the value shown in parentheses next to the respective ratings, with all 'don't know' responses excluded from the calculation.

3. Results

The following commentary gives the findings of the 2006 community survey compared with results obtained in earlier surveys. Detailed results are included in this report as Appendix II (only the statistically "significant" results are presented).

For each section a commentary is provided on the general results obtained in the survey. Significant results for each of the sub-groups of the population are also presented, and these segments are based on the gender and age of respondents.

3.1 General Issues of Concern to Local Residents

In an unprompted question respondents were asked to list the three (3) most important issues facing their local community.

The top ten issues mentioned are tabulated below. The results show that the environment has ranked second on the list, moving up from eighth position in the 2004 survey. Interestingly, the Lake has fallen in ranking, perhaps because residents are starting to witness improvements. Generally, these issues have consistently been rated as most important by residents in the catchment over the past five surveys, although the order has changed from year to year.

Approximately 14% of respondents did not provide an answer to this question.

The results are shown in the table below:

Response	**Percent**
Roads / Traffic	35.4%
Environment	22%
Crime	19.2%
Transport and public transport	13.2%
Over development	13.1%
Utilities / infrastructure	12.6%
Employment	8.9%
Facilities and support for Youth	7.6%
Education	6.5%
Lake	5.8%

**** Note: Only the top 10 issues are recorded in this abbreviated table. Respondents were asked to list their top three issues in order of importance. Hence, the above percentages do not add to 100%.**

Due to the open ended nature of the question a direct comparison between the results of the five surveys is difficult.

3.2 Attitudes Towards Changes in the Quality of the Environment

Rating of the environment

Respondents in the survey rated the current overall environment of Lake Macquarie at 6.8 on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 was equal to poor and 10 was equal to excellent. This compares with 6.7 in 2004, 6.4 in 2003, 6.2 in 2001 and 6.1 in 2000, and indicates that in general the rating continues to increase over time.

RATING OF OVERALL LAKE MACQUARIE ENVIRONMENT

Year	Mean	Std.Deviation	N
2000	6.13	1.67	597
2001	6.24	1.50	637
2003	6.40	1.32	582
2004	6.73	1.32	591
2006	6.81	1.48	599

These results can also be expressed in a different way, namely that 31% of respondents gave the environment a score of 8 and above, while 63% gave a score between 5 and 7 out of 10, as shown in the table below.

RATING OF OVERALL LAKE ENVIRONMENT * YEAR comparison

% within YEAR

	Year				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Under 5	12.2%	9.0%	8.1%	5.2%	4.8%
5-7	69.5%	71.4%	74.1%	67.9%	63.8%
8-10	18.3%	19.7%	17.9%	26.9%	31.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

There has been an upward trend in the results between surveys and generally, respondents appear to be more positive in their overall rating of the Lake. The consistent decline in the proportion of respondents rating the Lake environment less than 5 out of 10 is also noteworthy.

It continues to be the trend for older respondents to be more positive in their rating. For example, 41% of respondents aged 65+ gave the Lake a rating of 8-10 as compared to 18% of respondents in the 18-24 age group.

Changes in the environment over the past 5 years

The following table shows the community's attitudes towards changes in the quality of the environment.

QUALITY OF ENVIRONMENT IN LAKE MACQUARIE AREA OVER PAST 5 YEARS *YEAR Comparison

% within YEAR

	Year				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Got better	41.7%	46.2%	49.7%	51.3%	53.3%
Got worse	26.2%	19.9%	15.8%	17.1%	11.8%
Remained the same	27.9%	31.5%	28.5%	26.4%	30.3%
Don't know/ cannot say	4.2%	2.4%	5.9%	5.2%	4.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In 2006 over half of the survey sample (53%) believed the environment had improved, with only 11% believing the health of the environment had deteriorated.

The percentage of residents that believe the Lake is improving has continued an upward trend with a change of 11.6% over the five surveys. At the same time, the number of residents who believe the environment has got worse declined by 14.4%.

Overall, this year's survey found that over 83% of respondents felt the environment had improved or remained the same, while in 2000 that figure was approximately 70%. This represents an increase of 13%.

Changes in the Environment Over the Next Five Years

The following table shows the community's attitudes towards anticipated changes in the quality of the Lake environment over the next five years.

QUALITY OF ENVIRONMENT IN LAKE MACQUARIE OVER NEXT 5 YEARS *YEAR comparison

% with year

	Year				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Get better	48.0%	56.6%	58.2%	51.3%	48.5%
Get worse	22.9%	21.3%	17.9%	21.1%	19.9%
Remained the same	21.9%	17.9%	16.6%	19.7%	23.7%
Don't know/ cannot say	7.2%	4.2%	7.3%	7.9%	7.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The majority of people thought the quality of the environment in Lake Macquarie would improve or remain the same over the next five years. Around half (48%) said the environment would get better while another 23% thought it would stay the same.

Although the percentage of residents who think the Lake will get better has declined over the past two survey periods, the percentage who thinks it will remain the same has increased. A reason for this could be that the majority residents have already witnessed positive changes in the environment and believe the Lake will remain at the current status.

3.3 Importance of Various Environmental Issues

In an open-ended question respondents were also asked to identify the most important environmental issues facing Lake Macquarie and the surrounding area.

The major issues mentioned are shown in the table below. Approximately 13% of respondents did not provide an answer to this question.

Response	Percent
Litter	22.1%
Water quality	19.2%
Stormwater run-off	18.7%
Development	18.7%
Pollution	16.2%
Air Quality	15.7%
Loss of bushland	12.5%
Industry	8.3%
Fish Stocks	7.6%
Lake Health	6.5%
No answer	13.4%

**** Note: Only the top ten issues are included in the table. Respondents were asked to list their top three issues in order of importance. Hence, the above percentages do not add to 100%.**

Due to the open ended nature of the question a direct comparison between the results of the three waves of the survey is difficult.

Respondents were also presented with a list of environmental issues and asked how important they are to maintaining the environmental quality of Lake Macquarie. The issues were worded slightly differently in the survey this year, creating notable differences in the results. Wording was changed in the 2006 survey as follows:

Old wording	New wording
Seagrasses	Healthy seagrass beds
Urban development	Sensitive Urban Development
Drainage systems	Environmentally sensitive drainage systems
Vegetation around the Lake foreshores	Vegetation around the Lake foreshores
Seawalls around the Lake foreshores	Removing seawalls around the Lake foreshores

The proportion of people who rated the issue between 8-10 out of 10 (most important) is summarised below:

- seagrasses (65%)
- urban development (69%)
- drainage systems (81%)
- vegetation around the lake foreshores (68%)
- seawalls around the lake foreshores (21%)

The results for each issue follows.

IMPORTANCE OF HEALTHY SEAGRASS BEDS * YEAR comparison
% within Year

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Under 5	8.5%	3.6	3.7	4.2	2.9
5-7	30.5%	22.7	25.8	31.2	22.3
8-10	61.0%	73.8	10.5	64.6	65.4
Don't Know	0.0%	0	0	0	9.3
Total	100.0%	100	100	100	100

* New question 2006 survey only

IMPORTANCE OF SENSITIVE URBAN DEVELOPMENT * YEAR comparison
% within YEAR

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Under 5	16.2%	11.9%	11.0%	22.4%	2.3%
5-7	31.0%	29.5%	33.5%	34.0%	23.6%
8-10	52.8%	58.6%	55.5%	43.6%	69.7%
Don't Know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* New question 2006 survey only

IMPORTANCE OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE DRAINAGE SYSTEM * YEAR comparison
% within YEAR

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Under 5	3.2%	1.4%	2.2%	3.8%	1.2%
5-7	12.8%	11.2%	16.1%	17.8%	14.7%
8-10	84.0%	87.4%	81.7%	78.5%	81.3%
Don't Know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* New question 2006 survey only

IMPORTANCE OF VEGETATION AROUND THE LAKE FORESHORE * YEAR comparison
% within YEAR

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Under 5	4.0%	4.0%	2.1%	2.4%	3.6%
5-7	19.2%	16.5%	22.7%	26.9%	24.6%
8-10	76.7%	79.5%	75.3%	70.7%	68.7%
Don't Know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

IMPORTANCE OF REMOVING SEAWALLS AROUND LAKE FORESHORES * YEAR comparison
% within YEAR

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Under 5	15.3%	15.9%	11.6%	14.8%	24.0%
5-7	31.5%	31.0%	32.5%	35.3%	33.9%
8-10	53.2%	53.1%	55.9%	49.9%	21.4%
Don't Know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* New question 2006 survey only

For the first time the 2006 survey included a question giving residents two options for improving the water quality in Lake Macquarie.

The first option was treating stormwater run-off before it enters the Lake using devices such as wetlands. The second was substantially widening the channel entrance, slightly increasing the exchange of water between the ocean and the Lake but with other consequences. The stormwater option was rated between 8-10 (most important) by over 78% of respondents, while the channel widening option rated between 8-10 for only 36% of respondents.

This trend is very encouraging as in previous survey periods channel widening has rated as one of the most important issues despite having many negative consequences. This sharp decline in rating could be because the question has been re-worded (in earlier surveys water movement between the Lake and Ocean in Swansea Channel was included in the previous question).

TREATING STORMWATER RUN-OFF BEFORE IT ENTERS THE LAKE USING DEVICES SUCH AS WETLANDS * new question
% within YEAR

	YEAR
	2006
Under 5	1.6%
5-7	15.7%
8-10	78.7%
Don't Know	3.8%
Total	100%

WIDENING CHANNEL TO INCREASE WATER EXCHAGE BETWEEN LAKE AND OCEAN * YEAR comparison
% within YEAR

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Under 5	4.7%	2.2%	1.8%	2.3%	20.7%
5-7	13.8%	16.3%	9.7%	16.7%	27.7%
8-10	81.6%	81.5%	88.5%	81.1%	36.4%
Don't Know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* 2000 – 2004 surveys question was 'Importance of water movement between Lake and Ocean in Swansea Channel'.

3.4 Activities and Their Impacts on the Environment

One of the key figures in the 2000 survey was the 37% of respondents who did not see the connection between domestic activities and impacts on the Lake environment. As a result, this was emphasised in media materials and focussed on in the Living Lake Macquarie newsletter.

In years following the initial survey the data for this question remained inconsistent, perhaps because of the wording of the statement. For this reason, the wording for this survey period was slightly altered to gauge a more consistent result.

Old wording	**New wording**
My activities and actions do not have an impact on the Lake Macquarie environment	Lake Macquarie resident's activities and actions do not have an impact on the Lake and environment

The results indicate a positive swing with over 70% of respondents stating that they disagreed with the statement.

The results are tabled below:

ACTIVITIES/ACTIONS DON'T HAVE IMPACT ON LAKE AND ENVIRONMENT * YEAR comparison

% within YEAR

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Strongly Disagree	22.8%	16.8%	16.6%	14.7%	28.3%
Disagree	31.4%	33.5%	31.5%	37.6%	41.9%
Neither	8.6%	6.6%	14.2%	5.4%	13.6%
Agree	21.5%	30.7%	25.7%	35.3%	9.6%
Strongly Agree	15.1%	11.6%	9.1%	5.2%	2.5%
Don't Know	0.7%	0.8%	2.9%	1.8%	4.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Question slightly changed in 2006

The survey included a selection of questions relating to specific behavioural trends like the washing of cars, fertilising of lawns and gardens and the cleaning of driveways. These questions were designed to measure behaviour as opposed to attitudes. Behaviour was considered a better indicator of the effectiveness of past education programs and the messages conveyed to the community within the Lake Macquarie & Catchment Coordinator's program. Much of this education was aimed at reducing problems such as run-off into drainage systems.

Vehicle Washing

Approximately 89% of respondents have access to a car or a motor cycle (a drop of 9% from last survey period) and these people were then asked how often they wash their vehicle and where they would normally wash it.

The following table shows the community's activities in terms of frequency for washing motor car and motor cycles, with 11% of respondents saying that they wash their vehicle once each week or more, and a further 32% saying once or twice each month. 8% of respondents suggest that they never wash their vehicle.

FREQUENCY WASHING CAR/MOTORCYCLE * YEAR comparison

% within YEAR

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Never	3.8%	3.6%	3.3%	7.1%	8.8%
Once a week or more	20.9%	16.7%	16.5%	16.9%	11.6%
Once/twice a month	46.3%	50.9%	44.6%	34.6%	32.9%
Once/twice every 6 months	15.0%	17.0%	24.7%	18.6%	21.0%
Once / twice a year	4.7%	5.7%	6.6%	6.1%	6.0%
Irregularly	9.3%	6.1%	4.4%	16.6%	9.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The following table shows the community's activities in terms of location for washing motor car and motor cycles, with over half the respondents saying that they wash their vehicle on the lawn, and this has remained relatively constant over the past three waves of the survey. A further 20% said on the street or driveway.

This reflects the high level of awareness built up by a range of community education programs over the years, both in relation to water conservation and stormwater run-off.

WHERE DO YOU WASH IT * Year comparison

% within YEAR

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
On Lawn	65.2%	65.0%	65.0%	61.9%	50.5%
On Street/Driveway	23.7%	24.7%	23.3%	24.9%	20.2%
At Commercial Car Wash	9.2%	10.0%	9.5%	11.9%	10.6%
Other	1.9%	0.3%	1.8%	1.1%	1.7%
N/A	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	17.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Maintaining Lawns, Gardens and Paths

About 95% of people contacted said they had a lawn or garden. Of these respondents, 51% said that they fertilise their lawn or garden.

The following table shows a comparison in the habits of respondents who fertilise their lawns or gardens over the different surveys.

FERTILISE LAWN/GARDEN * YEAR comparison

% within YEAR

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Yes	44.9%	51.5%	48.5%	42.0%	51.0%
No	55.1%	48.5%	51.5%	58.0%	49.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

FREQUENCY FERTILISE LAWN/GARDEN * YEAR comparison

% within YEAR

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Never	4.7%	0.3%	3.2%	11.8%	17.0%
Once a week or more	1.1%	1.6%	0.0%	1.7%	3.2%
Once/twice month	5.8%	5.0%	3.6%	11.1%	7.1%
Once/twice every 6 months	25.6%	27.0%	17.8%	16.3%	18.9%
Once/twice yearly	44.8%	59.6%	61.9%	46.7%	38.1%
Irregularly	18.1%	6.6%	13.5%	12.5%	15.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The majority of respondents fertilise their garden once or twice yearly, this has remained constant throughout all the surveys, although the percentage is starting to fall.

In response to a question on methods of cleaning household pathways, the majority of those people surveyed said they used a broom (42%). A further 9% said they either used a blower or never cleaned them (38%). This left 9% of people who used a hose to clean their paths.

The results are tabled below:

METHOD TO CLEAN PATHS * YEAR comparison

% within YEAR

	YEAR				
	2000	2001	2003	2004	2006
Sweep with broom	54.5%	55.9%	55.3%	49.5%	42.6%
Hose	16.8%	17.6%	15.0%	7.3%	9.2%
Use a blower	6.9%	11.3%	12.5%	12.6%	9.2%
I don't clean them	21.5%	15.3%	16.8%	30.6%	38.8%
Other / N/A	0.3%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

3.5 Recreational Usage of Lake Macquarie

There is only a small proportion (14%) of households in the Lake Macquarie catchment where there is no-one in the household that uses Lake Macquarie for recreational purposes. In 17% of households one person uses the Lake, in 33% of households there are two people, in 12% of households three people and in 22% of households four or more people.

For respondents involved in this survey the majority (44%) suggest that they use the Lake at least once each week and a further 23% of people suggest once or twice each month. Only 2% of people suggest that used the Lake once or twice every 12 months and a further 5% suggest that they use it irregularly.

The survey suggests that the local community still regularly base recreational activities around the Lake. The following table breaks down the way in which people use the Lake.

Activity	Irregularly	Never	Other
Recreational fishing	3.3%	69.2%	27.5%
Sailing	2.5%	85.4%	11.8%
Boating	3.5%	64.4%	32.1%
Swimming	2.8%	76.1%	18.1%
Windsurfing	0.8%	95.0%	4.2%
Cycling around the foreshore	3.6%	71.8%	24.6%
Walking along the foreshore	4.6%	22.8%	72.6%
Picnicking on the foreshore	6.0%	40.2%	53.8%

Note: The 'Other' category includes once a week or more, once or twice a month, once or twice every six months and once or twice every 12 months.

The most popular Lake related activities continue to be walking and picnicking.

These results were consistent with the findings of previous survey reports. Picnicking and walking around the Lake would suggest a familiarity with foreshore areas and this continues to be generally true in reference to the question which asked respondents to allocate a rating of importance to a list of key issues.

Appendix I

Questionnaire used in the Community Survey

LAKE MACQUARIE CATCHMENT TELEPHONE SURVEY – May/June 2006

Telephone Number: _____ Questionnaire No: _____

Time of interview: _____ Date of interview: _____

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is …….. from Precision Research in Newcastle. We are carrying out a study in the local area. As part of this study I need to select a person from your household to interview. May I speak to the person in your household who is at least 18 years of age and who has the next birthday. **[IF PERSON NOT HOME ARRANGE TIME TO CALL BACK]**

Q.a **[TO RESPONDENT]** I would like to ask your opinions about various issues affecting the local area. What is the postcode of the suburb or locality you live in?

_____

Q.b Which Council area do you live in (i.e. where do you pay your Council rates)?

1 Lake Macquarie
2 Wyong
3 Don't Know

Q.c **[IF RESPONDENT STILL UNSURE OF COUNCIL AREA]** What is the name of your street or road? **[IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT LIVE IN CATCHMENT TERMINATE INTERVIEW]**

_____

Q.d The interview will take about 10 minutes. Is now a convenient time to do the interview?

1 Yes -----> Commence interview (Go to Q.1)
2 No -----> Go to Q.e

Q.e Could I call back at a more convenient time?

1 Yes -----> Go to Q.f
2 No -----> Terminate interview

Q.f What time and day. Thank you. I will call back at _____ on _____.

Q.1 I'd like to ask you some general questions about the local area. What do you think are the three most important issues affecting your community? **[RECORD ANSWER IN FULL]**

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

Q.2 Looking back, over the past five years do you think that the quality of the environment in Lake Macquarie area has …...? **[READ OUT OPTIONS 1 TO 3 - CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ONLY]**

1 Got better
2 Got worse
3 Remained the same
4 Don't know/cannot say

Q.3 Looking ahead, over the next five years do you think that the quality of the environment in Lake Macquarie area will …….? **[READ OUT OPTIONS 1 TO 3 - CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ONLY]**

1	Get better	3	Remain the same
2	Get worse	4	Don't know/cannot say

Q.4 On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1=poor and 10=excellent, how would you rate the current overall environment of Lake Macquarie? **[CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE - CIRCLE 11 IF THE RESPONDENT CAN NOT GIVE AN ANSWER]**

Poor										**Excellent**	**Don't Know**
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Q.5 On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree and 5=strongly agree, what is your attitude towards the following statement? **[DON'T READ OUT DON'T KNOW BUT CIRCLE 6 IF THE RESPONDENT CANNOT GIVE AN ANSWER]**

	Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neither**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**	**Don't Know**
Lake Macquarie residents' activities and actions do not have an impact on the Lake and environment	1	2	3	4	5	6

Q.6 Now specifically thinking of environmental issues. What do you think are the three most important environmental issues affecting Lake Macquarie and the surrounding area, in order of importance i.e. from most to least important? **[RECORD ANSWER IN FULL]**

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

Q.7 And now some questions about specific environmental issues in Lake Macquarie. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1=not important and 10=extremely important, how important are the following issues in maintaining the environmental quality of Lake Macquarie? **[CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ISSUE - CIRCLE 11 IF THE RESPONDENT CAN NOT GIVE AN ANSWER]**

Healthy Seagrass beds	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Sensitive urban development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Environmentally Sensitive Drainage systems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Vegetation around the lake foreshores	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Removing seawalls around the lake foreshores	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11

Q.7a I will now give you some options for improving the water quality in Lake Macquarie and would like you to rate these on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 = not important and 10=extremely important.

The first option is treating storm-water run-off before it enters the Lake using devices such as wetlands.

Not Important									**Extremely Important**	**Don't Know**
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11

The second is substantially widening the channel entrance that will slightly increase the exchange of water between the ocean and the Lake but with other consequences.

Not Important									**Extremely Important**	**Don't Know**
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11

Q.8 Do you own or have access to a car or motorcycle?

1 Yes
2 No → Go to Q.12

Q.9 How often do you USUALLY wash it? **[DO NOT READ OUT ANSWERS - ALLOW ONE ANSWER ONLY]**

1 Never → Go to Q.12
2 Once a week or more
3 Once or twice a month
4 Once or twice every 6 months
5 Once or twice every 12 months
6 Irregularly

Q.10 Where do you USUALLY wash it? [**ALLOW ONE ANSWER ONLY]**

1 On the lawn
2 On the street/driveway
3 At a commercial car wash
4 Other (please specify where) _____

Q.11 Do you have a lawn or garden?

1 Yes
2 No → Go to Q.16a

Q.12 Do you fertilise your lawn or garden?

1 Yes
2 No → Go to Q.15

Q.13 How often [do you USUALLY fertilise your lawn or garden]? **[DO NOT READ OUT ANSWERS - ALLOW ONE ANSWER ONLY]**

1 Never → Go to Q.15
2 Once a week or more
3 Once or twice a month
4 Once or twice every 6 months
5 Once or twice every 12 months
6 Irregularly

Q.14 How do you clean the paths in your garden? **[DO NOT READ OUT ANSWERS - ALLOW ONE ANSWER ONLY]**

1	Sweep with a broom	3	Use a blower
2	Hose	4	I don't clean them

And now some questions on usage of the lake

Q.15a How many members of your household, including yourself, use Lake Macquarie (i.e the lake itself) for recreational activities, including walking along the foreshore and using the cycleways?

1 None → Go to Q.18
2 One
3 Two
4 Three
5 Four or more

Q.15b How often do you personally use Lake Macquarie for recreational activities, including walking along the foreshore and using the cycleways?

1 Never → Go to Q.18
2 Once a week or more
3 Once or twice a month
4 Once or twice every 6 months
5 Once or twice every 12 months
6 Irregularly

Q.16 Specifically, how often have you been involved in the following activities in the past 12 months? **[READ OUT ACTIVITIES AND CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ONLY]**

	Once a week week or more	Once or twice a month	Once/twice every 6 months	Once/twice each year	Irregularly	Never
Recreational fishing	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sailing	1	2	3	4	5	6
Boating	1	2	3	4	5	6
Swimming	1	2	3	4	5	6
Windsurfing	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cycling around the foreshore	1	2	3	4	5	6
Walking along the foreshore	1	2	3	4	5	6
Picnicing on the foreshore	1	2	3	4	5	6

Q.17 Do you have any other comments about environmental issues affecting Lake Macquarie? **[RECORD ANSWER]**

_____

And now a few questions to help classify your answers

Q.18 What is the gender of the respondent? **[CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ONLY]**

1 Male 2 Female

Q.19 What is your age?

_____

Q.20 What is your work status? **[CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ONLY]**

1	Full-time	3	Unemployed	5	Student
2	Part-time/casual	4	Home duties	6	Retired/Pension

Q.21 What type of dwelling do you live in? **[DO NOT READ OUT ANSWERS - ALLOW ONE ANSWER ONLY]**

1 Separate house
2 Townhouse
3 Flat/unit
4 Other (please specify) _____

Q.21a How many years have you resided in the Lake Macquarie area?

_____

Q.22 How many people aged **18 years and over** are there living **permanently** in your household, **including yourself**?

_____

Thank you for your co-operation today

Appendix II

Detailed significant results of the 2006 Community Survey

GENERAL ISSUES 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Crime	56	9.3	10.8	10.8
	Environment	49	8.1	9.4	20.2
	Employment	19	3.1	3.7	23.9
	Open cut mining	19	3.1	3.7	27.6
	Health	27	4.5	5.2	32.8
	Transport	36	6.0	6.9	39.7
	Roads / Traffic	113	18.7	21.8	61.5
	Safety	24	4.0	4.6	66.1
	Over development	35	5.8	6.7	72.8
	Rates	5	.8	1.0	73.8
	Youth / Facilities & support for	23	3.8	4.4	78.2
	Child care	8	1.3	1.5	79.8
	Kerb and guttering	2	.3	.4	80.2
	Education	7	1.2	1.3	81.5
	Drought	3	.5	.6	82.1
	Vandalism	2	.3	.4	82.5
	Retail outlets	2	.3	.4	82.9
	Lack of policing	7	1.2	1.3	84.2
	Petrol prices	7	1.2	1.3	85.5
	Water conservation	4	.7	.8	86.3
	Sporting facilities	1	.2	.2	86.5
	Charlestown Square	1	.2	.2	86.7
	Industry	3	.5	.6	87.3
	IR / workplace laws	3	.5	.6	87.9
	Litter	10	1.7	1.9	89.8
	Population	4	.7	.8	90.6
	Lake	31	5.1	6.0	96.5
	Cleanliness	4	.7	.8	97.3
	Aging population	12	2.0	2.3	99.6
	Housing	2	.3	.4	100.0
	Total	519	85.9	100.0	
Missing	System	85	14.1		
Total		604	100.0		

GENERAL ISSUES 2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Crime	38	6.3	8.3	8.3
	Environment	52	8.6	11.3	19.6
	Employment	20	3.3	4.4	24.0
	Tourism	3	.5	.7	24.6
	Public Transport	36	6.0	7.8	32.5
	Parking	6	1.0	1.3	33.8
	Roads / Traffic	67	11.1	14.6	48.4
	Over Development	29	4.8	6.3	54.7
	Graffiti / Vandalism	18	3.0	3.9	58.6
	Litter	7	1.2	1.5	60.1
	Health	22	3.6	4.8	64.9
	Lack of local character	5	.8	1.1	66.0
	Youth	23	3.8	5.0	71.0
	Noise	15	2.5	3.3	74.3
	DA approvals	3	.5	.7	74.9
	School crossings	1	.2	.2	75.2
	Lack of development	1	.2	.2	75.4
	Belmont airport	1	.2	.2	75.6
	Social	14	2.3	3.1	78.6
	Council Services	15	2.5	3.3	81.9
	Police	3	.5	.7	82.6
	Water usage	3	.5	.7	83.2
	Parks	15	2.5	3.3	86.5
	footpaths	17	2.8	3.7	90.2
	Lack of infrastructure	13	2.2	2.8	93.0
	Poor representation from MPs	1	.2	.2	93.2
	Access	4	.7	.9	94.1
	Taxes	1	.2	.2	94.3
	Selling of public land	1	.2	.2	94.6
	Education	14	2.3	3.1	97.6
	Arts and cultural facilities	1	.2	.2	97.8
	Drainage	6	1.0	1.3	99.1
	Rates	1	.2	.2	99.3
	Population growth	3	.5	.7	100.0
	Total	459	76.0	100.0	
Missing	System	145	24.0		
Total		604	100.0		

GENERAL ISSUES 3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Crime	22	3.6	6.7	6.7
	Environment	32	5.3	9.8	16.5
	Employment	15	2.5	4.6	21.0
	Pollution	9	1.5	2.7	23.8
	Charlestown Square getting too big	10	1.7	3.0	26.8
	Utilities / infrastructure	63	10.4	19.2	46.0
	Community Facilities	15	2.5	4.6	50.6
	Public Education	18	3.0	5.5	56.1
	Over development	15	2.5	4.6	60.7
	Roads	34	5.6	10.4	71.0
	Vandalism	2	.3	.6	71.6
	Public transport	7	1.2	2.1	73.8
	Energy alternatives	1	.2	.3	74.1
	Aboriginal issues	1	.2	.3	74.4
	Social justice	3	.5	.9	75.3
	Parking	12	2.0	3.7	79.0
	Tap water quality	1	.2	.3	79.3
	Local economy	2	.3	.6	79.9
	Water conservation	2	.3	.6	80.5
	Lighting	3	.5	.9	81.4
	Health	10	1.7	3.0	84.5
	Coal Mining	1	.2	.3	84.8
	Social	8	1.3	2.4	87.2
	Lake / waterways	4	.7	1.2	88.4
	Petrol prices	10	1.7	3.0	91.5
	Shopping	15	2.5	4.6	96.0
	Recreational facilities	5	.8	1.5	97.6
	Swansea Bridge	1	.2	.3	97.9
	Industry	3	.5	.9	98.8
	Tourism	3	.5	.9	99.7
	Multiculturalism	1	.2	.3	100.0
	Total	328	54.3	100.0	
Missing	System	276	45.7		
Total		604	100.0		

QUALITY OF ENVIRONMENT OVER PAST 5 YEARS * AGE Crosstabulation

% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
QUALITY OF ENVIRONMENT OVER PAST 5 YEARS	Got better	51.5%	45.3%	54.4%	58.5%	53.8%	53.3%
	Got worse	12.1%	8.5%	15.8%	14.6%	8.2%	11.8%
	Remained Same	30.3%	39.6%	25.9%	24.4%	32.6%	30.3%
	Don't Know	6.1%	6.6%	3.8%	2.4%	5.4%	4.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.638(a)	12	.164
Likelihood Ratio	16.785	12	.158
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.109	1	.292
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 3 cells (15.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.53.

QUALITY OF ENVIRONMENT OVER PAST 5 YEARS * GENDER Crosstabulation
% within GENDER

		GENDER		Total
		Male	Female	
QUALITY OF ENVIRONMENT OVER PAST 5 YEARS	Got better	59.5%	49.0%	53.3%
	Got worse	10.9%	12.3%	11.8%
	Remained same	25.9%	33.3%	30.3%
	Don't Know	3.6%	5.3%	4.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.799(a)	3	.079
Likelihood Ratio	6.843	3	.077
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.579	1	.010
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.45.

QUALITY OF ENVIRONMENT OVER NEXT 5 YEARS * AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
QUALITY OF ENVIRONMENT OVER NEXT 5 YEARS	Get better	48.5%	50.0%	57.0%	42.3%	44.6%	48.5%
	Get worse	15.2%	12.3%	22.2%	24.4%	20.1%	19.9%
	Remained same	27.3%	31.1%	17.7%	26.0%	22.3%	23.7%
	Don't know	9.1%	6.6%	3.2%	7.3%	13.0%	7.9%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.480(a)	12	.013
Likelihood Ratio	26.214	12	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.453	1	.117
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 1 cells (5.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.62.

RATING OF OVERALL ENVIRONMENT * AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
RATING OF OVERALL ENVIRONMENT	Under 5	0.0%	3.7%	6.9%	4.9%	4.5%	4.8%
	5 – 7	81.9%	67.0%	67.0%	65.6%	54.4%	63.8%
	8 -10	18.2%	29.2%	26.0%	29.5%	41.1%	31.4%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	40.213(a)	36	.289
Likelihood Ratio	43.322	36	.187
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.784	1	.016
N of Valid Cases	599		

a 27 cells (54.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

RATING OF OVERALL ENVIRONMENT * GENDER Crosstabulation
% within GENDER

		GENDER		Total
		Male	Female	
RATING OF OVERALL ENVIRONMENT	Under 5	6.9%	3.4%	4.8%
	5 - 7	63.0%	64.3%	63.8%
	8 - 10	30.0%	32.3%	31.4%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.260(a)	9	.113
Likelihood Ratio	15.515	9	.078
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.914	1	.088
N of Valid Cases	599		

a 6 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .41.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Foreshore	7	1.2	1.3	1.3
	Litter	49	8.1	9.4	10.7
	Recycling	6	1.0	1.1	11.9
	Water quality	88	14.6	16.8	28.7
	Water useage	17	2.8	3.3	31.9
	Stormwater run-off	64	10.6	12.2	44.2
	Footpaths	2	.3	.4	44.6
	Pump out toilets on boats	1	.2	.2	44.7
	Seagrass	3	.5	.6	45.3
	Clean up Council Areas	3	.5	.6	45.9
	Pollution	98	16.2	18.7	64.6
	Cleanliness	19	3.1	3.6	68.3
	Coal Mining	30	5.0	5.7	74.0
	Over Development	51	8.4	9.8	83.7
	Moarings - too many	2	.3	.4	84.1
	Commercial Fishing	3	.5	.6	84.7
	Winding Creek	1	.2	.2	84.9
	Air Quality	29	4.8	5.5	90.4
	Dredging of channel	4	.7	.8	91.2
	Siltation	8	1.3	1.5	92.7
	Open Space	2	.3	.4	93.1
	Soil contamination (Pasminco)	3	.5	.6	93.7
	Additional Channel entrance	1	.2	.2	93.9
	Loss of bushland	19	3.1	3.6	97.5
	Wetlands	1	.2	.2	97.7
	Drainage	7	1.2	1.3	99.0
	Fishing nets	4	.7	.8	99.8
	population	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	523	86.6	100.0	
Missing	System	81	13.4		
Total		604	100.0		

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES 2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Stormwater run-off	31	5.1	7.0	7.0
	Litter	51	8.4	11.5	18.5
	recycling	3	.5	.7	19.1
	Water ways	9	1.5	2.0	21.2
	Water useage	9	1.5	2.0	23.2
	Air quality	38	6.3	8.6	31.8
	Bluebottles	1	.2	.2	32.0
	Lake	39	6.5	8.8	40.8
	Fires	2	.3	.5	41.2
	Land Care Programs	6	1.0	1.4	42.6
	Power stations /Industry	41	6.8	9.2	51.8
	Sedimentation	4	.7	.9	52.7
	Loss of bushland	29	4.8	6.5	59.2
	water quality	20	3.3	4.5	63.7
	Remediation of Pasminco	2	.3	.5	64.2
	Fish stocks	35	5.8	7.9	72.1
	Septic Sewerage Systems	19	3.1	4.3	76.4
	Foreshore	3	.5	.7	77.0
	Over Development	45	7.5	10.1	87.2
	Community Awareness	2	.3	.5	87.6
	Waste management (landfill)	12	2.0	2.7	90.3
	Environmentally sensitive infrastructure	3	.5	.7	91.0
	Noise pollution	6	1.0	1.4	92.3
	Drainage	7	1.2	1.6	93.9
	Tidal flow	1	.2	.2	94.1
	Parks	10	1.7	2.3	96.4
	Leisure opportunities	5	.8	1.1	97.5
	erosion	4	.7	.9	98.4
	Wetlands	1	.2	.2	98.6
	Domestic Animals	2	.3	.5	99.1
	Black ooze / smelly seaweed	3	.5	.7	99.8
	channel widening	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	444	73.5	100.0	
Missing	System	160	26.5		
Total		604	100.0		

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES 3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	wildlife	23	3.8	6.9	6.9
	Litter	34	5.6	10.2	17.1
	Recycling	6	1.0	1.8	18.9
	Lake	8	1.3	2.4	21.3
	Water useage	4	.7	1.2	22.5
	Housing density	11	1.8	3.3	25.8
	West side of Lake	2	.3	.6	26.4
	Lack of rain	1	.2	.3	26.7
	Vandalism	3	.5	.9	27.6
	Weed problem	16	2.6	4.8	32.4
	Industry	9	1.5	2.7	35.1
	Salination	2	.3	.6	35.7
	Impact on Fauna	2	.3	.6	36.3
	Stormwater run-off	18	3.0	5.4	41.7
	Closure of Cockle Creek	1	.2	.3	42.0
	Loss of Bushland	28	4.6	8.4	50.5
	Education Programs	19	3.1	5.7	56.2
	Air Quality	28	4.6	8.4	64.6
	Channel	14	2.3	4.2	68.8
	Water quality	8	1.3	2.4	71.2
	Domestic animals	4	.7	1.2	72.4
	Catchment management	3	.5	.9	73.3
	Fish stocks	11	1.8	3.3	76.6
	Seaweed wrack	2	.3	.6	77.2
	More development	2	.3	.6	77.8
	Vegetation around Lake	12	2.0	3.6	81.4
	Boats	9	1.5	2.7	84.1
	Seawalls	4	.7	1.2	85.3
	Over development	17	2.8	5.1	90.4
	Noise	3	.5	.9	91.3
	Lack of infrastructure	5	.8	1.5	92.8
	Over usage	11	1.8	3.3	96.1
	Walkways	3	.5	.9	97.0
	Open space	6	1.0	1.8	98.8
	Erosion	1	.2	.3	99.1
	Wetlands	1	.2	.3	99.4
	drainage	2	.3	.6	100.0
	Total	333	55.1	100.0	
Missing	System	271	44.9		
Total		604	100.0		

IMPORTANCE OF HEALTHY SEAGRASS BEDS * AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
HEALTHY SEAGRASS BEDS	Not important	.0%	1.9%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.5%
	2	3.0%	.0%	.6%	.8%	.5%	.7%
	3	3.0%	1.9%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.7%
	4	3.0%	.9%	1.3%	.0%	1.1%	1.0%
	5	3.0%	10.4%	1.9%	1.6%	2.7%	3.6%
	6	18.2%	8.5%	3.8%	2.5%	4.3%	5.3%
	7	15.2%	13.2%	18.4%	11.5%	10.3%	13.4%
	8	6.1%	30.2%	24.7%	26.2%	27.2%	25.7%
	9	15.2%	5.7%	20.3%	19.7%	18.5%	16.7%
	Extremely important	18.2%	20.8%	25.9%	31.1%	17.4%	23.1%
	Don't know	15.2%	6.6%	1.9%	6.6%	17.9%	9.3%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	105.726(a)	40	.000
Likelihood Ratio	104.042	40	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.708	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	603		

a 26 cells (47.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.

IMPORTANCE OF SENSITIVE URBAN DEVELOPMENT * AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
SENSITIVE URBAN DEVELOPMENT	Not important	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.2%
	2	6.1%	2.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%
	3	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.5%
	4	.0%	.9%	1.9%	.0%	.5%	.8%
	5	9.1%	10.4%	3.2%	4.1%	2.7%	4.8%
	6	12.1%	8.5%	7.0%	4.1%	7.1%	7.0%
	7	9.1%	11.3%	15.2%	8.9%	11.4%	11.8%
	8	24.2%	24.5%	22.8%	26.8%	28.8%	25.8%
	9	18.2%	10.4%	20.3%	15.4%	19.0%	17.1%
	Extremely important	18.2%	30.2%	27.2%	34.1%	21.2%	26.8%
	Don't know	3.0%	.9%	1.9%	6.5%	7.6%	4.5%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	72.149(a)	40	.001
Likelihood Ratio	68.565	40	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.801	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 25 cells (45.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

IMPORTANCE OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE DRAINAGE * AGE Crosstabulation

% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
	Not important	.0%	.0%	.6%	.8%	.0%	.3%
	2	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.2%
	3	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.2%
	4	.0%	.9%	.6%	.0%	.5%	.5%
	5	3.0%	4.7%	1.9%	2.4%	3.8%	3.1%
	6	9.1%	5.7%	5.1%	.8%	3.3%	4.0%
	7	15.2%	9.4%	8.2%	1.6%	8.7%	7.6%
	8	24.2%	22.6%	16.5%	22.8%	27.2%	22.5%
	9	24.2%	16.0%	19.0%	21.1%	15.8%	18.2%
	Extremely important	24.2%	39.6%	48.1%	46.3%	33.7%	40.6%
	Don't know	.0%	.9%	.0%	3.3%	6.5%	2.8%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	57.586(a)	40	.035
Likelihood Ratio	65.161	40	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.686	1	.194
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 32 cells (58.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

IMPORTANTANCE OF VEGETATION AROUND FORESHORE *AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
	Not important	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.5%	.5%
	2	3.0%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	2.2%	1.2%
	3	.0%	1.9%	.6%	.8%	.0%	.7%
	4	3.0%	2.8%	.6%	.0%	1.1%	1.2%
	5	6.1%	5.7%	3.8%	4.1%	6.0%	5.0%
	6	18.2%	6.6%	5.7%	4.1%	8.2%	7.0%
	7	6.1%	13.2%	14.6%	8.1%	14.7%	12.6%
	8	24.2%	25.5%	19.0%	23.6%	23.9%	22.8%
	9	12.1%	17.9%	21.5%	21.1%	13.6%	17.9%
	Extremely important	24.2%	26.4%	32.3%	34.1%	21.7%	28.0%
	Don't know	3.0%	.0%	.6%	2.4%	8.2%	3.3%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	64.504(a)	40	.008
Likelihood Ratio	68.499	40	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	.443	1	.506
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 26 cells (47.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.

IMPORTANCE OF REMOVING SEAWALLS* AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
REMOVING SEAWALLS	Not important	9.1%	6.6%	8.9%	8.1%	12.5%	9.4%
	2	6.1%	6.6%	9.5%	8.1%	6.0%	7.5%
	3	3.0%	1.9%	3.2%	6.5%	6.0%	4.5%
	4	.0%	.9%	3.8%	3.3%	2.7%	2.6%
	5	12.1%	17.0%	15.8%	17.9%	16.8%	16.6%
	6	6.1%	14.2%	5.7%	6.5%	7.6%	7.9%
	7	24.2%	10.4%	13.9%	5.7%	4.9%	9.4%
	8	12.1%	15.1%	8.9%	10.6%	6.5%	9.8%
	9	.0%	3.8%	5.1%	3.3%	6.0%	4.5%
	Extremely important	3.0%	5.7%	7.0%	12.2%	5.4%	7.1%
	Don't know	24.2%	17.9%	18.4%	17.9%	25.5%	20.7%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	54.710(a)	40	.061
Likelihood Ratio	54.351	40	.065
Linear-by-Linear Association	.306	1	.580
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 15 cells (27.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .87.

TREATMENT OF STORMWATER RUN-OFF * AGE Crosstabulation

% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
TREATMENT OF STORMWATER RUN-OFF	Not important	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.8%
	2	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.1%	.3%
	3	.0%	.9%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.3%
	4	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.2%
	5	3.0%	2.8%	1.3%	1.6%	3.3%	2.3%
	6	6.1%	4.7%	5.1%	4.1%	2.2%	4.0%
	7	18.2%	14.2%	12.0%	6.5%	4.9%	9.4%
	8	33.3%	27.4%	23.4%	22.8%	27.7%	25.8%
	9	15.2%	18.9%	21.5%	18.7%	21.2%	20.0%
	Extremely important	15.2%	29.2%	34.8%	39.8%	32.1%	32.9%
	Don't know	9.1%	.0%	1.3%	5.7%	6.0%	3.8%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	52.889(a)	40	.083
Likelihood Ratio	60.221	40	.021
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.655	1	.031
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 32 cells (58.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

TREATMENT OF STORMWATER RUN-OFF* GENDER Crosstabulation
% within GENDER

		GENDER		Total
		Male	Female	
TREATMENT OF STORMWATER RUN-OFF	Not important	1.6%	.3%	.8%
	2	.8%	.0%	.3%
	3	.4%	.3%	.3%
	4	.0%	.3%	.2%
	5	2.8%	2.0%	2.3%
	6	5.3%	3.1%	4.0%
	7	10.9%	8.4%	9.4%
	8	26.7%	25.2%	25.8%
	9	19.4%	20.4%	20.0%
	Extremely important	29.1%	35.6%	32.9%
	Don't know	2.8%	4.5%	3.8%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.106(a)	10	.218
Likelihood Ratio	14.194	10	.164
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.065	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 8 cells (36.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .41.

WIDENING CHANNEL* AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
WIDENING CHANNEL	Not important	9.1%	9.4%	6.3%	7.3%	7.1%	7.5%
	2	9.1%	6.6%	5.7%	5.7%	2.7%	5.1%
	3	9.1%	2.8%	5.1%	1.6%	3.3%	3.6%
	4	6.1%	7.5%	3.2%	5.7%	2.7%	4.5%
	5	24.2%	9.4%	7.0%	5.7%	7.6%	8.3%
	6	9.1%	7.5%	8.2%	6.5%	6.5%	7.3%
	7	3.0%	21.7%	12.7%	10.6%	8.7%	12.1%
	8	6.1%	11.3%	15.8%	17.9%	24.5%	17.5%
	9	.0%	6.6%	10.1%	8.1%	7.1%	7.6%
	Extremely important	3.0%	9.4%	8.2%	17.9%	12.0%	11.3%
	Don't know	21.2%	7.5%	17.7%	13.0%	17.9%	15.2%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	68.800(a)	40	.003
Likelihood Ratio	68.606	40	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.930	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 12 cells (21.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.20.

WIDENING CHANNEL * GENDER Crosstabulation

% within GENDER

		GENDER		Total
		Male	Female	
WIDENING CHANNEL	Not important	9.3%	6.2%	7.5%
	2	5.3%	5.0%	5.1%
	3	4.0%	3.4%	3.6%
	4	5.3%	3.9%	4.5%
	5	8.5%	8.1%	8.3%
	6	5.7%	8.4%	7.3%
	7	12.1%	12.0%	12.1%
	8	19.4%	16.2%	17.5%
	9	8.5%	7.0%	7.6%
	Extremely important	12.1%	10.6%	11.3%
	Don't know	9.7%	19.0%	15.2%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.174(a)	10	.165
Likelihood Ratio	14.639	10	.146
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.154	1	.042
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.00.

ACTIVITIES / ACTIONS IMPACT ON ENVIRONMENT * AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
ACTIVITIES / ACTIONS IMPACT ON ENVIRONMENT	Strongly disagree	18.2%	34.0%	29.7%	36.6%	20.2%	28.4%
	Disagree	69.7%	40.6%	41.8%	33.3%	43.7%	42.0%
	Neither	3.0%	14.2%	13.3%	14.6%	14.8%	13.6%
	Strongly agree	6.1%	.0%	5.1%	.8%	2.2%	2.5%
	Don't Know	3.0%	1.9%	1.3%	3.3%	8.2%	4.0%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	47.637(a)	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	52.621	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.563	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	603		

a 10 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .82.

ACTIVITIES / ACTIONS IMPACT ON ENVIRONMENT * GENDER Crosstabulation
% within GENDER

		GENDER		Total
		Male	Female	
ACTIVITIES / ACTIONS IMPACT ON ENVIRONMENT	Strongly disagree	27.5%	28.9%	28.4%
	Disagree	43.7%	40.7%	42.0%
	Neither	11.3%	15.2%	13.6%
	Agree	11.7%	8.1%	9.6%
	Strongly agree	2.8%	2.2%	2.5%
	Don't Know	2.8%	4.8%	4.0%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.530(a)	5	.355
Likelihood Ratio	5.584	5	.349
Linear-by-Linear Association	.014	1	.905
N of Valid Cases	603		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.14.

WHERE WASHED * AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
WHERE WASHED	On lawn	52.0%	61.5%	60.9%	64.5%	58.7%	60.8%
	On street/driveway	36.0%	18.7%	23.3%	21.8%	28.7%	24.3%
	At car wash	8.0%	18.7%	15.8%	11.8%	7.7%	12.7%
	Other	4.0%	1.1%	.0%	1.8%	4.2%	2.0%
	Other	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.2%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.123(a)	16	.174
Likelihood Ratio	22.923	16	.116
Linear-by-Linear Association	.038	1	.846
N of Valid Cases	502		

a 11 cells (44.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

FERTILISE LAWN/GARDEN * AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
FERTILISE LAWN/GARDEN	Yes	33.3%	42.9%	43.2%	58.3%	61.7%	51.1%
	No	66.7%	57.1%	56.8%	41.7%	38.3%	48.9%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.514(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	20.691	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.509	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	568		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.15.

HOW OFTEN FERTILISE LAWN/GARDEN * AGE Crosstabulation

% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
HOW OFTEN FERTILISE LAWN/GARDEN	Never	31.3%	24.6%	20.2%	12.3%	13.1%	17.3%
	Once/twice week	6.3%	3.3%	3.6%	3.7%	2.5%	3.3%
	Once/twice month	6.3%	9.8%	7.1%	4.9%	7.4%	7.1%
	Once/twice every 6 months	12.5%	19.7%	19.0%	21.0%	18.0%	19.0%
	Once/twice yearly	12.5%	34.4%	35.7%	40.7%	43.4%	38.2%
	Irregularly	31.3%	8.2%	14.3%	17.3%	15.6%	15.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.157(a)	20	.577
Likelihood Ratio	18.470	20	.556
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.559	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	364		

a 10 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .53.

CLEAN PATHS * AGE Crosstabulation

% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
CLEAN PATHS	Sweep with broom	27.3%	29.2%	32.9%	42.3%	47.3%	38.2%
	Hose	3.0%	10.4%	8.2%	12.2%	5.4%	8.3%
	Use a blower	9.1%	13.2%	8.2%	6.5%	6.5%	8.3%
	Don't clean them	45.5%	34.9%	40.5%	30.9%	30.4%	34.8%
	N/A	15.2%	12.3%	10.1%	8.1%	10.3%	10.4%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.734(a)	16	.075
Likelihood Ratio	24.535	16	.078
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.559	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 3 cells (12.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.73.

MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD WHO USE LAKE* AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD WHO USE LAKE	none	3.0%	5.7%	8.9%	7.3%	31.7%	14.6%
	one	12.1%	13.2%	8.9%	20.3%	26.8%	17.6%
	two	12.1%	21.7%	25.3%	48.8%	39.9%	33.2%
	three	36.4%	19.8%	14.6%	14.6%	.5%	12.4%
	four or more	36.4%	39.6%	42.4%	8.9%	1.1%	22.2%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	229.041(a)	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	258.501	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	149.256	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	603		

a 2 cells (8.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.10.

PERSONAL USE OF LAKE* AGE Crosstabulation
% within AGE

		AGE					Total
		18-24	25-39	40-54	55-64	65+	
PERSONAL USE OF LAKE	Never	3.1%	5.8%	6.6%	7.6%	32.2%	14.0%
	Once/twice week	40.6%	54.8%	55.6%	54.6%	30.4%	47.0%
	Once/twice month	40.6%	24.0%	26.5%	22.7%	19.9%	24.1%
	Once/twice every 6 months	9.4%	9.6%	5.3%	7.6%	7.0%	7.3%
	Once/twice yearly	3.1%	2.9%	.7%	2.5%	2.3%	2.1%
	Irregularly	3.1%	2.9%	5.3%	5.0%	8.2%	5.5%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	85.952(a)	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	81.196	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.273	1	.132
N of Valid Cases	577		

a 8 cells (26.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .67.

Appendix III

General comments made by respondents

Survey	General comments made by respondents
7	Very concerned about stormwater run-off, especially in areas prone to erosion, need for vegetation
10	Worried about volume of traffic, road system isn't coping and exhaust. Worried about high rise on waterfront and population density impact.
12	Need to monitor development and industry
13	Lack of kerb and guttering. Drainage could be better.
14	Would like to see more cycleways
21	It's a shame Belmont area is too filthy to swim in
22	They are trying
24	Need for some car parking for the elderly
27	Likes greening of foreshore, but wouldn't like it to become inaccessible due to use of oversized species
28	Like the pathway accessibility & greening of the foreshore
30	Council delivery is impressive and well directed
33	Seawalls stop erosion
44	Happy with Lake Macquarie water quality
46	Power Stations heating water in Lake
47	Environmental impact statements usually mean nothing and never stop anything. Council rangers very effective.
48	Not enough Council involvement in general
53	Development potential for Tourism particularly Morriset & Cooranbong
54	Continual beautification of the area
56	Could use screens across drainage pipes leading into Lake Macquarie
58	Would love to see better control of litter around foreshore e.g wardens
67	Concerned about people's general disregard with litter and broken bottles etc avoid Lake area
70	Oppossed to seawall seagrass is trapped and causes smells as can't wash in and out. Lake has got cleaner with more fish and with no commercial netting has stopped there are more marine/ animal life
73	Do something about sewage overflowing Warners Bay, during heavy rain it affects Marks Point as well
77	People don't appreciate the area and leave rubbish around
78	Excessive use of motor boats and skiers creating strong wash to share causing unnatural erosive force
79	Dredging the channel would cleanse the lake more and increase tidal flow
82	It's a beautiful place. Take care of the Lake for the future
83	Provide walking tracks right around the Lake, such as Toronto, Kilaben Bay, etc. Would like the channel deepened for boats nor necessarily widened
85	Control of lantana, noxious weeds at Swansea is needed
87	Don't allow multistory apartment complexes along the foreshore. The foreshore should be accessible to everyone not just a select few
90	Deepen channel for boat access

91	Address cleanliness of the lake
93	People sailing should not dump rubbish and litter. Do the right thing, consider more bins near Pippis for bottles
101	Urban run-off needs to be further addressed
102	Urban run-off is a major concern
106	Main issue is silt. Like to see more Mangrove silt catchment
107	Need more info from Council on environmental concerns
110	Jeff Jansson is doing a great job and needs continued funding. Loves bulk waste collection as it stops bushland dumping.
111	Need better boat ramps
114	Doing a good job except for overgrown areas.
115	Would like to see the Lake like it used to be
117	Worried about litter in the Lake
125	Would like water quality to continue to improve
129	More publicity to encourage use of water tanks
133	Older areas seem neglected by comparison to new estates
134	Wishes Wyong Council would lift its standard – LM is doing much better
137	A nice place to be
141	Concerned about mine subsidence
143	Foreshore could be tidied up more – would like to see channel made accessible to accommodate a marina
146	So much rubbish along the foreshore
148	Stop putting washed rock around the edge, replace it with sand, its dangerous
164	Improvement since Pasminco closed
165	Urban development is too close to the Lake
170	It's improving since Pasminco's closure. Wished people took their litter with them.
182	Litter on foreshore and through stormwater a problem
183	Alto Creek used to be open to the sea – it could be re-opened as extra drainage / flushing. Have concerns about loss of vegetation on frontage (Marmong Point) concerns about drainage given population density.
184	They are trying. Given nature of bureaucracy seem to have an evolving view
186	Need for more dredging to clear out power station soot
189	Lake is getting cleaner
191	Need to open channel to allow for dirty water to get out
215	Feels that some improvements are actually negative – ie. cleaning up muddy, weedy areas looks and smells better but destroys some natural ecology (shrimp used to live in these areas now there is none)
220	Council are doing their up most to make it beautiful – love the Lake
221	More signs needed to pick up rubbish. Loves the Lake thinks it is beautiful
231	Dog poo on foreshore needs policing
232	Important Council maintains cleanliness around Warners Bay and Eleebana
247	Since Cockle Creek closed I don't have a problem. My biggest cause for concern is industry being near the lake even with run-off. Every business should be checked and made to comply.
250	I think they are doing a good job

257	Optimistic that local authorities are moving in
260	More work needs to be done with Stormwater run-off
261	A consistently high level of management needs to exist to cope with the increase in development around the Lake, otherwise quality of environment will suffer proportionately.
263	Ruining recreational activities
264	Channel needs widening and deepening for many reasons mostly Swansea
268	Removal of commercial fishing the best thing to happen – improved quality of Lake immensely
269	Coming to Lake Macquarie from the Tuggerah Lakes district you realize hoe beautiful and clean it is around here
270	Motor boat pollution
274	Current policies / ideas regarding management of the Lake need to take long term consequences into account
286	Run-off from mining – underground diverting creeks
288	Don't want to see it ruined like Newcastle Foreshore – no apartment blocks right on the water.
289	Seagrass is a pest for those of us who live on foreshores with direct water access.
301	Having lived on the Lake all my life it is sad to see decline of natural environment – too many new suburbs with huge houses
307	Crucial that development be restrained, keep waterfronts open and accessible to all, increase green space
309	Extremely important to try and get things cleaned up – community awareness needs to be increased
313	People need to stop dropping litter in and around the Lake
316	Someone need to take responsibility for the Lake in the longer term
318	Lake needs to be kept cleaner
319	Pollution needs to be dealt with
321	Happy with Council
324	Population needs to be controlled
326	Too much seaweed
327	Sewers overflow into waterways
328	Lakes entrance not wide enough
336	Run-off biggest concern
340	Pretty good job. Pleased
342	Happy they have stopped commercial fishing
349	Make sure green corridors are developed / maintained around newly developing areas
352	Need to work hard to keep Lake Macquarie and parks pristine
353	More bins needed at Warners Bay
357	What effects us here at Killaben Bay is dust from Power stations and the whole Lake is copping it.
358	They are doing a good job – the best they can
365	Lake Macquarie is a lovely area
375	Run-off needs to reduced
379	Concerned about plastic bags and fishing hooks being left around lake

382	Greater policing on waterways needed - Waters are over fished and people disregard size limits.
384	Need more funding for Land Care programs
393	Number of trees good
400	Water health is the most important issue
402	The quality of the Lake is getting better – cleaner water quality
403	Keep going forwards not backwards to protect the Lake. It is a lot cleaner now than it used to be.
406	Keep maintaining walkways / gardens around foreshore areas
407	Other estuaries and creeks that feed into Lake need attention and regeneration not just dredging the Channel
411	More planning and forethought needed with urban development. Too much focus on Warners Bay and Charlestown
413	Should deepen the channel so yachts can come in and out to boost tourism
415	Need another channel entrance before the bridge
418	Lack of access to quality swimming areas around the foreshores
420	There are significant vegetated areas visited by birds on the endangered list – these areas should be protected
425	Fix the flow of the Lake and the Lake will fix itself
427	Better now silt traps in. Will improve now Pasminco has shut down.
430	Stopping commercial fishing and Pasminco shut down are good for the Lake
431	Can't put too much on the foreshore ie: development
444	People don't understand the value of the Lake
446	There's a danger with development. Better management needed, eco-sensitive
448	People need to be more cautious about litter around the Lake
451	Still lots of litter around Lake
453	Rathmines Park could do with a clean up
455	Good to see people trying
460	Lake seems to be on the improve
461	Netting at Warners Bay catches seaweed that then rots and stinks. Disappointed with people who cut down trees because they block the view
464	Concern about population density in area. Need for clean up of dead seagrass
467	Were going in the right direction
474	Know that they are trying – greatest concern is need for vegetation around banks
475	Main concern is industrial zoning in proximity of residential areas and waterways
476	Council work is going well, hope to see more of the same
477	Would like to see sympathetic development on foreshores so that more could enjoy its benefits
485	Belmont is neglected in environmental revitalization compared to other areas. Need for more garbage bins on the foreshore in general.
486	Need a an exclusion zone outside the headlands to stop people catching all the mullet
487	Rangers need more authority in relation to the dumping of rubbish
488	Would like to see more noxious weeds addressed
489	The Lake is why we live here – Council efforts are very visible

493	Would like to see Lantana removed
494	Glad to see sewerage improvements as have concerns about medium to density developments
496	Better maintenance and clean out of drains
498	More work could be done on effluent discharge and stormwater management
504	Stormwater is the critical issue
505	Water quality of Lake has improved over last 4-5 years
510	Happy about re-vegetation around Lake
515	Water quality has improved out of sight over the last 5 years.
517	Don't sell off Ferris Oval to Charlestown Square
518	Just keep it beautiful!
523	Need to deepen channel
539	Better consultation to protect wetlands at Belmont needed
567	Not as many fish as before
593	Damage from Pasminco will not be seen for some time as it sits at the bottom of the Lake