

**Schedule of Submissions**

No/ Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
1	21 June 2016	Susan Giles Environmental Superintendent	Yara Pilbara Fertilisers Village Road Burrup Karratha WA 6714	<p><b>Submission on the Hearson Cove FMP</b></p> <p>Issue/Comment No. 1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording on page 13 "<i>It has been confirmed by Yara...</i>" implies that Yara can set or define buffer areas, which is incorrect.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No. 1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal buffers are set through legislative processes and are determined using guidelines and policies. Yara has no direct control over the formalisation of buffers.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No. 1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reword the sentence to state "Investigations into separation distances indicate that there are no current formal buffers".</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment No.1.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Query as to whether the tracks at the northern end of the foreshore would be closed to the public, with ranger access only. Currently the plan reflects access to all.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.1.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further discussions at community workshops indicated that many people use these northern tracks to access other areas such as Cowrie Cove and Watering Cove. It was deemed that a better outcome would be to keep the access open but consolidate the number of tracks to one.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.1.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes needed.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment No.1.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Query regarding the use of wood fired BBQ's, as mentioned on page 46.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.1.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mention of wood fired BBQ's on page 46 is misleading, it is actually stating that these types of BBQ's are to be replaced.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.1.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording on page 46 should be changed to clearly reflect the proposal to upgrade the BBQ's to gas fuelled options.</li> </ul>

No/ Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
2	22 June 2016	Jamie Brady, Senior Planning Officer.	Department of State Development (DSD), 1 Adelaide Terrace East Perth WA 6004.	Issue/Comment No.2.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be an investigation into the formalisation of buffers between industry and the neighbouring foreshore reserve, using the Environmental Protection Authority's (EPA) <i>Draft Environmental Assessment Guidance for Separation Distances between Industrial and Sensitive land Uses (2015)</i>.</li> </ul>	Officer Response No.2.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no objection to the investigation of buffers for industry on the Burrup Peninsula but it should not compromise plans for use and enjoyment of surrounding non-industrial areas. A reasonable balanced approach needs to be determined.</li> </ul>	Officer Recommendation No.2.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An action be placed in the management table that indicates a need for investigation into buffer areas but that this should not compromise plans for use and enjoyment of surrounding non-industrial areas.</li> </ul>
3	24 June 2016	Ben Cranston, Corporate Affairs Advisor.	Woodside. Burrup Pnsla Karratha WA 6714	Issue/Comment No.3.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hearson Cove FMP captured previous comments and inputs from Woodside, no further comments required.</li> </ul>	Officer Response No.3.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	Officer Recommendation No. 3.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response.</li> </ul>
4	22 June 2016	Marcus Holmes on Behalf of Ngarluma Aboriginal Corporation	Land Equity Legal Suite 27, 375 Hay Street, Subiaco WA 6008.	Issue/Comment No.4.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NAC has previously outlined its expected consultation requirements when it comes to City plans and has provided input into the Strategic Community Plan, the Draft Indigenous Engagement Strategy and the Draft Foreshore Management Plans. NAC feels its comments have been received to varying degrees.</li> </ul>	Officer Response No. 4.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	Officer Response No 4.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response required.</li> </ul>
				<b>NAC Submission on Hearson Cove FMP</b> Issue/Comment No 4.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NAC has not been consulted in the management plan design process (although NAC has met with UDLA to give feedback and seek input). The Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation (MAC) and the Yaburara and Coastal Mardudhunera Aboriginal Corporation (YACMAC) were consulted.</li> </ul>	Officer Response No. 4.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultant that prepared the FMP on behalf of Council met with NAC to make NAC aware of the project and allow NAC to have input. The City has had close consultation regarding the plan with MAC given that Hearson Cove is surrounded by the Murujuga National Park. No discussions were had with YACMAC.</li> </ul>	Officer Recommendation No. 4.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response needed. As submission notes, early consultation was undertaken.</li> </ul>

No/ Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<p>Issue/Comment No. 4.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Foreshore Management Plan does not mention NAC as the traditional custodians of the area.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No. 4.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This area is subject to the Burrup and Maitland Industrial Estates Agreement (BMIEA). As such, Native Title rights are extinguished in this area. Instead an agreement exists between the State and the Aboriginal Corporations. In this agreement five Aboriginal groups (including NAC) are represented by MAC.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No. 4.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to Aboriginal Groups can be expanded within the plan to detail all groups represented by MAC.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment No. 4.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NAC to be included in the management table as a party in all management actions. In particular, NAC requests involvement in any Aboriginal Heritage Surveys, any cultural heritage management plan and any environmental management plan. NAC also request involvement in any shared management agreement that may be developed between the City and MAC. NAC has also requested to be included in the Reference Group and any ongoing studies/plans.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No. 4.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Ngarluma people are not the determined Native Title holders of Murujuga, instead they are represented by MAC. It is appropriate for management actions to be channelled through MAC. The City will continue to consult with NAC on this and other plans and projects the City is undertaking. It is recommended that the transfer of the City's Hearson Cove reserve into the Murujuga National Park be investigated and progressed. This would allow NAC to influence management via its membership on MAC.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No. 4.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NAC be involved in management actions of the Hearson Cove FMP via its membership on MAC. It is recommended that an action be included in the Management Table to investigate and progress the transfer of the City's Hearson Cove reserve into the Murujuga National Park.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment No. 4.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City needs to provide sufficient resources (including financial) to ensure that NAC is able to be involved as outlined in its submission.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No 4.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NAC needs to raise requests like these through MAC as its representative body in relation to the Murujuga National Park.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No. 4.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No modification required.</li> </ul>

No/ Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<p><b>NAC Submission on Wickham Boat Beach FMP</b></p> <p>Issue/ Comment No. 4.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NAC would like to see an expansion of its role outlined in the plan. This includes a shared surveillance and monitoring program with Aboriginal Ranger representatives, building relationships with Traditional Custodians and including Traditional Custodians in future use and management of the foreshore. NAC seeks to ensure that these type of Traditional Custodian considerations are entered into with NAC and that this agreement is reflected within the management table.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No. 4.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the determined Native Title Holders across the study area, it is important to acknowledge NAC's role as the Traditional Custodians. It is appropriate for the City to continue to consult with NAC about the ways the parties can work better together.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendations No. 4.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the recurring reference to 'Traditional Custodians' and replace instead with reference to the Ngarluma people and NAC (as their representative body) as the determined Traditional Custodians.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment No.4.7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NAC notes the statement within the plan that indicates that the Wickham foreshore area is covered by the Ngarluma Native Title determination and wants this further strengthened in the management table.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.4.7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City recognises the Ngarluma people as the determined Native Title holders in this area. The area that forms the primary focus of the plan is Reserve 32465. Native Title does not exist over Reserve 32465.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No. 4.7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reword the reference to the Native Title Determination within the text to clearly define those parts of the study area where Native Title exists.</li> </ul>
5	22 June 2016	Virginia Wright Acting Regional Mining Registrar	Department of Mines And Petroleum (DMP). Cnr Welcome Rd and Headland Place Karratha WA 6714	<p>Issue/Comment No. 5.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DMP had no comment to make on the FMP's</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No. 5.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.5.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change required.</li> </ul>
6	22 June 2016	Tiffany Vale Chief Heritage Officer.	Department of Aboriginal Affairs. 151 Royal Street, East Perth, WA 6004.	<p>Issue/Comment No.6.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presence of currently listed heritage sites within the study areas is confirmed.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.6.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Referring to listed Aboriginal heritage sites legitimises the information provided in the plans.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number of listed Aboriginal Heritage Sites as detailed on the DAA website should be reiterated in the management plans.</li> </ul>

No/ Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<p>Issue/Comment No. 6.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that the results of any future heritage surveys be forwarded to DAA for its records.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No. 6.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensuring that the DAA has access to the results of surveys will allow for the most up-to-date information to be available for land use planning decisions.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An action should be include in the management table of each FMP stating the need to refer any information gathered during heritage surveys to relevant agencies.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment No.6.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that any works in the management area be undertaken in conjunction with the use of the Aboriginal Heritage Due Diligence Guidelines.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.6.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The use of Aboriginal Due Diligence Guidelines when undertaking works in these reserves will ensure appropriate regard is given to cultural considerations.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include an action within the FMPs that requires the use of the DAA Due Diligence Guidelines when undertaking works in the study areas.</li> </ul>
7	22 July 2016	Vicki Long	PO Box 93 Wickham	<p><b>Submission regarding Hearson Cove Foreshore MP</b></p> <p>Issue/Comment No.7.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are some discrepancies in the information on landform stability and that the statement "<i>the area is highly unstable and therefore will require the highest level of management response</i>" is an overestimation of the instability of the area.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.7.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paragraph on instability reflects a grammatical error and needs to be changed.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the area is typically stable with studies of historical photographs showing little shoreline change. The stament that the near shore area is highly unstable is an overestimation.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.7.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reword the chapter on landform stability to be grammatically correct.</li> <li>Reword the information on instability to correctly reflect shoreline stability.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment No.7.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater information on environmental weeds should be provided in the MP. In particular, the back dunes of the foreshore area are heavily infested. It was further stated that building of infrastructure in these back dune areas would require a complete weed management program.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.7.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weed control is an important and ongoing issue for the management of foreshore areas and should be a consideration in this MP.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.7.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include an action that states the need for a weed survey and associated weed eradication program.</li> <li>Include an action that states the need for avoiding the spread of weed infestations during construction activities in the foreshore reserve.</li> </ul>

No/ Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<p>Issue/Comment No.7.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presence of certain weed species as listed in the FMP is queried. Should these weed species exist, there is a need for a weed management program.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.7.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The additional action of a weed survey as proposed in officer recommendation No.7.2 will ensure an accurate record of the weeds present in the study area. This action will also ensure the implementation of a weed eradication program.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No. 7.3::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per recommendation No. 7.2.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment No 7.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a reference to 'vulnerable ecological communities' on page 28. The name of this ecological community is queried. There is no mention of Priority Ecological Communities (PEC's) and/or Threatened Ecological Communities (TEC's) that may occur in the study area.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No. 7.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Threatened Species and Communities page on the Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPAW) website appears to indicate that the only threatened species that may occur in the area is the <i>Burrup Peninsula Rock Pool/Pile Community</i> (a PEC). Confirmation should be made as to whether it occurs in the study area, so that management actions can be determined accordingly.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No. 7.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include an action within the FMP that proposes an ecological survey to determine the presence of any listed threatened species or communities.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment No 7.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formalising access as mentioned on page 28, is an important consideration for preservation of the environment and the safety of those that use the area. A 'formal pedestrian access path' is over engineering and removes the sense of freedom that the beach has to offer.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No. 7.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formalising pedestrian access as mentioned in the plan refers to low key, unobtrusive amenity infrastructure. This includes; an access way between toilet facilities, car parking and the shelters, and a proposed future walk trail near the Murujuga Living Centre. No pathway has been proposed for the majority of the foreshore area, thereby keeping the natural amenity of the beach as is.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.7.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change required.</li> </ul>

No/ Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
8	10 June 2016	Diane Pentz Chief Executive Officer	Regional Development Australia (RDA) Pilbara Suite 5 /7 Morse Court Welcome Lotteries House, Karratha WA 6714.	Issue/Comment 8.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RDA Pilbara has offered its support for the Hearson Cove FMP, in particular the RDA positively noted the City's proposed engagement with Aboriginal Corporations in the management of the reserve.</li> </ul>	Officer Response No.8.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	Officer Recommendation No.8.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change required.</li> </ul>
9	21 June 2016	Allisdair McDonald. Pilbrara Regional Manager.	Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPaW). Lot 3 Cnr Mardie & Anderson Rd, Karratha Light Industrial Estate.	<b>Submission Regarding Hearson Cove FMP</b> Issue/Comment No.9.1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent changes to threat categories for fauna may mean that some of the data used in the plan may be out of date.</li> </ul>	Officer Response No.9.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, threat categories listed in the plan need to be confirmed with current information.</li> </ul>	Officer Recommendation No.9.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change threat categories listed for fauna as required.</li> </ul>
				Issue/Comment No.9.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional high risk environmental weed should be included in the list of weeds that are a threat to Hearson Cove. Need for a strong weed management strategy.</li> </ul>	Officer Response No.9.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per Officer Response 7.2</li> </ul>	Officer Recommendation No.9.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per Officer Recommendation No.7.2.</li> </ul>
				<b>Submission Regarding Wickham Boat Beach FMP</b> Issue/Comment No. 9.3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Lerista neviniae</i>, a vulnerably listed skink is known to inhabit the area. Further information on its distribution should be mentioned in the plan, with any vegetation rehabilitation programs to be undertaken in line with the skinks habitat requirements.</li> </ul>	Officer Response No.9.3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The importance of this species in terms of localised distribution and decline in numbers has been mentioned in the plan. The inclusion of skink habitat specific species in the revegetation list on page 36, will help benefit the persistence of the species.</li> </ul>	Officer Recommendation No.9.3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that flora species that make up the skinks habitat are included in the proposed revegetation list.</li> </ul>
				Issue/Comment No. 9.4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to the beach during the turtle nesting season should be controlled to prevent impact on nesting adults or</li> </ul>	Officer Response No.9.4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently the City has limited capacity to patrol the beach and enforce restrictions on those</li> </ul>	Officer Recommendation No. 9.4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reword actions in the plan on signage to reflect greater emphasis on the need to</li> </ul>

No/ Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				hatchlings. The impacts of lighting on nesting turtles and/or hatchlings should also be mentioned in the plan.	<p>that would drive during this season. The aim is that by closing and consolidating informal 4WD access points, beach traffic will be limited to certain areas, thereby localising the impact. Signage is also currently in place stating the importance of restricting driving to outside of the breeding months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development of the foreshore area within the MP is limited to non-obtrusive, low maintenance amenity, mostly located in the northern amenity node. Artificial lighting will be limited. Education to beach users on the impacts of lighting on turtles can be included on proposed signage.</li> </ul>	educate the public on turtle breeding times. Signage can include information on the impacts of lighting on nesting turtles.
				<p>Issue/Comment No. 9.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that by limiting access to Wickham Boat Beach Foreshore through the closing of unauthorised tracks will push people onto Bells Beach, which is an even more significant turtle nesting area.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.9.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans for closing of tracks are proposals only and would require further investigation prior to implementation. Future track closures should be undertaken in consultation with DPaW to ensure no indirect results on nesting turtles.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.9.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reword management actions within the text that are in relation to the closing and up grading of tracks, to reflect a collaborative approach with DPaW.</li> </ul>
10	22 June 2016	Renaë Rutherford Principal Community Engagement	Rio Tinto Iron Ore – Cape Lambert PO Box 21 Wickham WA 6720.	<p><b>Submission Regarding Wickham Boat Beach FMP.</b></p> <p>Issue/Comment No.10.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern into the closing of unauthorised track, and the upgrade and maintenance of others. In particular, the interactions with Boat Beach Rd and measures that will be undertaken to ensure safety, construction standards, maintenance and location of tracks onto Rio Tinto leased areas is queried. Need for</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.10.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas marked on maps within the FMP that depict the closing off of authorised tracks, and the upgrade of others, are indicative at this stage. The implementation of these actions would require more detailed site plans. At this stage it would be beneficial for the City to consult with Rio Tinto on the location</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.10.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reword management actions within the text that are in relation to the closing and up grading of tracks, to reflect a collaborative approach with Rio Tinto.</li> <li>Include an action that proposes the review and renegotiation of the <i>Deed of Access – Boat Beach</i></li> </ul>



No/ Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<p>signage when crossing into Rio Tinto areas, so that the public are aware of proximity to active port operations. Concern regarding public access to tracks north of the yacht club, as this breaches Rio Tinto's environmental conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In light of the proposed track closures, it is requested that the existing <i>Deed of Access – Boat Beach Road</i> be reviewed and renegotiated.</li> </ul>	<p>and nature of track closures and upgrades. This can be done in conjunction with a review and renegotiation of the <i>Deed of Access – Boat Beach Road</i>.</p>	<p>Road to capture the proposed/agreed access across the Rio Tinto leased area.</p>
				<p>Issue/Comment No.10.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Figure 28 on page 32 of the plan represents only registered Aboriginal Heritage Sites, and indicated that both Rio Tinto and NAC have more accurate spatial and cultural information. Rio Tinto can seek NAC endorsement to release this information to the City for reference in this plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.10.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional cultural information would be beneficial to the plan and the City should accept Rio Tintos offer to provide the data subject to NAC approval.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.9.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include a management action within the FMP that indicates an update of the plan should additional cultural information be sourced.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment No. 9.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Query proposed '<b>shared surveillance and cultural monitoring program with Aboriginal Ranger representatives from Traditional Custodian Groups</b>'. What is envisaged with this initiative and does it involve NAC's engagement and endorsement?</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.9.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further detail regarding the shared surveillance and monitoring program needs to be gathered. This information can then be incorporated into a <i>Foreshore Works and Implementation Plan</i>. Also, reference to 'Traditional Custodian Groups' should be replaced with reference to NAC as the traditional custodians. As such, NAC will be consulted with during the implementation of this action.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.9.:2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that an action be added to Management Table that discusses the future <i>Foreshore Works and Implementation Plan</i>.</li> <li>Ensure that this future planning involves details on the shared monitoring and surveillance program</li> <li>Ensure that the wording for this action involves a reference to NAC as the traditional custodians.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment 9.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an opportunity for Rio Tinto business and operational signage to</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.9.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The installation of Rio Tinto signage should only be at</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No. 9.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include an action within the plan that allows for the</li> </ul>

No/ Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				be located at appropriate entry points into the foreshore.	those areas where Rio Tinto operations are in close proximity.	installation of Rio Tinto signage in areas where the foreshore and Rio Tinto operations may interact.
				<p>Issue/Comment 9.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed Eco toilets and dune boardwalk are in the Rio Tinto leased areas. The purpose of the leased areas is industrial and as such, Rio Tinto would not support the location of these amenity items.</li> <li>In this regard, the proposed upgrade of the carpark should be located within the City's reserve, not in the existing Port Walcott Yacht Club. Furthermore, Rio Tinto does not support any future development of the Port Walcott Yacht Club site due to safety issues surrounding Cape Lambert operations.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No. 9.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Eco toilets were placed in this location due to storm surge considerations, however, as stated previously, the plans are only indicative at this stage. Exact location of the proposed amenity structures should be included in a <i>Foreshore Works and Implementation Plan</i>. The boardwalk was placed in this location to correlate with what appeared to be a natural walking trail, but should be removed due to the Rio Tinto leasing situation.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No. 9.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed location of Eco toilets and dune boardwalk should be moved from their present spot on the plan to within the City's reserve. The action as per recommendation 9.2, in regards to the <i>Foreshore Works and Implementation Plan</i>, should include detailed information on amenity structures.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment 9.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rio Tinto requests clarity on the roll out of proposed management actions within the plan, including required approval processes, revegetation processes, location of signage, and the treatment of dune erosion areas.</li> <li>Concern that by closing tracks on Wickham Boat Beach it will divert traffic to the adjoining Bells Beach.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.9.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As stated above, this is not an implementation plan. Further study, investigation, planning and design will be undertaken at later stages of implementation. Rio Tinto should be kept informed and take part in decision making during the implementation phase, especially for the planning for the closure of unauthorised tracks.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No. 9.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include within the management table an action that allows for Rio Tinto input during the implementation planning stage of the MP.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment 9.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Query as to whether the actions proposed in the MP are to be considered within the anticipated Wickham Beautification Plan, which is subject to the <i>Rio Tinto and City of Karratha Town Beautification Funding Agreement</i>.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No 9.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No funding has been allocated to undertake the implementation of this plan as yet. Should it be deemed that actions are suitable to be contained within the Wickham Beautification Plan, funding agreements will</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.9.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response required at this stage.</li> </ul>

No/ Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
					negotiated through the proper channels.	
11	26 July 2016	Eric McNally	Port Walcott Yacht Club	<p>Issue/Comment 9.7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of amenity in the area should be undertaken with consideration of lighting impacts on nesting turtles and the tenure of the area.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.9.7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per officer response 8.3, no construction of artificial lighting is proposed in this plan. Amenity locations on the maps within the plan should be within the City's reserve areas.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendation No. 9.7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure the correct location of amenity within plans (located within City reserve boundaries).</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/ Comment 9.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested editorial amendments for the document.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response No.9.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All suggested changes are valid and should be made within the document.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendations No.9.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make changes as suggested.</li> </ul>
				<p>Issue/Comment 11.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of off-road vehicles have been seen driving into the sand dunes, destroying vegetation. Can the City rangers monitor this and can there be an education program?</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Response 11.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disrespect by off-road vehicle drivers and their treatment of dune vegetation is a prime concern for the management of natural areas.</li> </ul>	<p>Officer Recommendations No.11.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The management plan currently addresses 4WD access through the closure of unauthorised tracks. It is recommended additional patrolling by City rangers be undertaken based on community concern with this type of activity. In addition, there is the possibility for an education program on the problem with irresponsible off-road driving be initiated.</li> </ul>