

Full Verbatim – Public Feedback on the Draft Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy CS24

Submission	Method	Age	Cultural Ancestry	Feedback	Change to Draft Policy CS24 (Yes or No) Administrations Response
1	Paper Survey Wickham Library	16-19yrs	Fijian	No comment	Changes: No Response: only completed statement 'Agree-Disagree' rating questions
2	Paper Survey Karratha Library	90+	Australian	<i>"A broader consultation process to engage with those in the community who don't use a computer. Face to face consultation is always more productive."</i>	Changes: No Response: already addressed by Principle 2: Inclusivity and Equity
3	Paper Survey Karratha Library	20-29yrs	Belgian	<i>"Make Dampier Hwy to Gapridge and de witt to the LIA walkable and with sidewalks and.or bike paths. For tradies to get to work without the use of a vehicle or fuel. Make LIA Walkable for pedestrians"</i>	Changes: No Response: Project specific feedback. Passed onto Community Planning who are responsible for Footpath Strategy.
4	Paper Survey Karratha Library	80-89yrs	Welsh	No comment	Changes: No Response: only completed statement 'Agree-Disagree' rating questions
5	Paper Survey Karratha Library	50-59yrs	Scottish	No comment	Changes: No Response: only completed statement 'Agree-Disagree' rating questions
6	Paper Survey Karratha Library	40-49yrs	New Zealand	<i>"How much access to topics does the community get or will that be minimal?"</i>	Changes: No Response: Feedback addressed by Policy Statement and Principle 1: Timely and Adaptable
7	Paper Survey	80-89yrs	English	<i>"I still consider that the policy is good but there are so many factors not addressed, last week it was announced that local elections would not be mandatory,</i>	Changes: No

	Karratha Library			<p><i>it wasn't consulted. The Royal Commission into COVID was knocked back. Why did we do a survey to which everyone agreed? So many residents are not computer savi, do not have facebook and are still isolated. No one can say this isnt good guidelines we just need some action. words are not enough.</i></p> <p><i>There has been numerous consideration of the needs of seniors, never any feedback.</i></p> <p><i>A recent example of misinformation a lady from old (living in a caravan) rang the shire regarding pensioner accommodation and was told there were none."</i></p>	<p>Response: Concerns acknowledged and addressed by Policy Statement and Principle 1: Timely and Adaptable</p>
8	Paper Survey Karratha Library	70-79yrs	Australian	<p><i>"It's been a long time since we heard from CofK regarding Seniors village. Sometimes it hard to get the balance right, too much information vs not enough. Regular updates would be helpful across all programs the city has committed to, via email and electronic communication or even postal service for some."</i></p>	<p>Changes: Yes</p> <p>Response: Principal 2: Inclusivity and Equity:– extend explanation to explicitly include the term <i>communication</i>.</p>
9	Workshop	40-49yrs	Australian (Dampier Resident)	<p><i>"The stakeholder list in the guidelines is broader and covers more stakeholders. The policy needs to match this. Local business, not for profit not mentioned as stakeholders in the definition.</i></p> <p><i>Local business operators have vast local knowledge and understanding of the local population.</i></p> <p><i>Local businesses are trying to have a rest during December and January so that's not the best time to engage with them.</i></p> <p><i>Closing the loop important - not good to receive the outcome without the 'why'. During the food van policy review, I couldn't understand why there isn't a rule of thumb regarding number of food vans per population or compared to the number of existing bricks and mortar food/hospitality venues. No density study seems to have been done which doesn't make sense to me."</i></p>	<p>Changes: Yes</p> <p>Response: It is acknowledged the stakeholder list detailed in the draft Engagement Guidelines is more extensive and that both documents need to be inclusive of all identified stakeholders. It is also important to use language that communicates this list of identified stakeholders is not exhaustive.</p> <p>Changes: No</p> <p>Response: Periods When Engagement May be Avoided – the example of 'between the last Ordinary Council Meeting of a calendar year and the first</p>

					<p>Ordinary council Meeting of a new calendar year is inclusive of the December to January period when local businesses are less likely to participate in engagement activities.</p> <p>Changes: No Response: Further feedback noted, however project specific and does not impact the draft policy.</p>
10	Workshop	40-49yrs	Australian (Karratha Resident)	<p><i>“Heading in the right direction.”</i></p> <p><i>“Like that we have included remaining adaptable to changing needs. We were involved as stakeholders when a storage shed was being built at Nickol West oval. By the time we understood exactly where the shed was going, by seeing the slab laid, we were able to let the City know it was encroaching on the playing field. But we were told it was too late to do anything about it and now we just have to live with it.”</i></p> <p><i>“The objectivity principle (impartial, balanced and informed) also seems to address this. It references all engagement data will be accurately represented and communicated in a timely fashion for all stakeholders to be involved. Expect that will mean the City will communicate ‘this is what we heard’, provide an opportunity to check that the City heard it right before using that information to make decisions.”</i></p> <p><i>“Periods When Engagement May be Avoided: the season change-over for local sporting groups is a very busy time so participation in engagement opportunities are likely</i></p>	<p>Changes: No Response: Positive sentiment and reference to relevance of Principle 1: Timely and Adaptable.</p> <p>Changes: No Response: Feedback related to Principle 4: Objectivity: Impartial, Balanced and Informed is addressed by the Final Draft Engagement Guidelines page 13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How Do We Plan and Conduct Engagement? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Step 5: Carry out the plan and adjust as needed, and ○ Step 6: Close the Loop by sharing what we heard and how we used your feedback. ○ Specific acknowledgement made that if engagement activities are seeking feedback, Steps 5 and 6 may need to be repeated until the

				<p><i>to be low e.g. month before start of winter season (March) and start of summer season (Sept)."</i></p> <p><i>"All Engagement data will be accurately represented and communicated to all stakeholders following engagement activities...can it be clearer about to who and by when."</i></p> <p><i>"Believe you need to build in incentives for community to participate in engagement."</i></p>	<p>outcome is achieved – recognising the need for an iterative process.</p> <p>Changes: Yes</p> <p>Response: The draft Policy did not adequately capture periods where participation in Engagement activities may be limited due to Community or Stakeholder involvement in activities or events that are not related to specific cultural and religious events but are relevant to segments of community or stakeholder groups that may be the target group for an engagement activity. It is important this is captured by the policy to ensure Council commits to also considering avoiding engagement activities during these periods if participation is likely to be limited.</p> <p>Changes: Yes</p> <p>Response: There is a precedence of Council incentivising Community and Stakeholders to support participation in Engagement activities e.g. Annual Community Survey prizes, Strategic Community Plan Major Review Shop Local Vouchers, Merchandise giveaways or coffee vouchers at Engagement pop-up stalls. Recommend this element of the City's Engagement practice is</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					captured by the policy within Principle 2: Inclusivity and Equity
11	Paper Survey Karatha Library	40-49yrs	New Zealand	<i>"Will older features of some facilities be included?"</i>	Changes: No Response: Relevance of feedback to draft policy document unclear
12	Paper Survey Roebourne Pop-Up	20-29yrs	Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander and English	<i>"Suggest a Feedback Box available all the time in Roebourne for community so they can raise issues with the City at any time. Also suggest a poster or more information about what the City is responsible for and what it isn't. Like main roads, State Government is responsible for this, local government is responsible for roads on residential streets, something like that so people understand what the City of Karratha is and isn't responsible for."</i>	Changes: No Response: The Engagement Guidelines capture some of these suggestions. Place-based engagement considerations also addressed in operational Engagement Framework Implementation Plan, Goal 1 actions.
13	Paper-Survey Wickham Library	20-29yrs	Australian	<i>"Listen to residents who genuinely engage with the community (City) instead of focusing on meeting quotas."</i>	Changes: No Response: Feedback does not impact policy. Have interpreted 'meeting quotas' to be referring to data that is statistically valid. There is recognition that this is not always achievable or appropriate to inform a decision. Principle 4: Objectivity states 'All Engagement data will be accurately represented and communicated.'
14	Paper Survey Wickham Library	30-39yrs	African	No comment	Changes: No Response: only completed statement 'Agree-Disagree' rating questions
15	Online Survey	30-39yrs	English	No comment	Changes: No Response: only completed statement 'Agree-Disagree' rating questions

16	Online Survey	50-59yrs	Australian	<i>"Thankyou for the wide range of response options. I appreciate the different options and ways you make information available as well as the feedback options that still allow my voice to be heard regardless of my availability and varying levels of wellness."</i>	Changes: No Response: Aligns with Principle 2: Inclusivity and Equity being experienced through recent engagement activities.
----	---------------	----------	------------	--	--

Full Verbatim – Public Feedback on the Draft Engagement Guidelines

Submission	Method	Age	Cultural Ancestry	Feedback	Change to Draft Policy CS24 (Yes or No) Administrations Response
1	Paper Survey Wickham Library	16-19yrs	Fijian	No comment	Changes: No Response: only completed statement 'Agree-Disagree' rating questions
2	Paper Survey Karratha Library	90+	Australian	<i>"I don't have a computer so please consider alternative ways of engaging with people like me and yes, I am still capable and would love to be part of the process."</i>	Changes: No Response: Feedback addressed in Draft Engagement Guidelines. Aligns with Principle-led Commitment to Engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Inclusive, Equity and Culturally Respectful. Aligns with Step 2 of how we plan and conduct engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand who is affected and how to communicate with and involve them
3	Paper Survey Karratha Library	20-29yrs	Belgian	<i>"Make roads (to gap rideg, dewitt to LIA)have sidewalks so bikes and predestrians can will roll on for trades/jobs. Make Dampier Hmy and De Witt walkable and rideable by bikes/scotters to Gapbridge and LIA Create footpaths at the LIA for presetrians and trade"</i>	Changes: No Response: Project specific feedback. Passed onto Community Planning who are responsible for Footpath Strategy
4	Paper Survey Karratha Library	80-89yrs	Welsh	<i>"The engagement Guidelines appear to be Directed to CofK Staff. May be relevant to include our elected members who do not appear to be consulting with their electors?"</i>	Changes: No Response: Roles and responsibilities for Engagement are detailed on page 22 of the Draft Engagement Guidelines , including

					those of the City's Mayor and Elected Council Members. Appropriate training will also be identified for Elected Members as per the operational Engagement Framework Implementation Plan 2026-2030. A summary of the goals and actions identified in the implementation plan can be found in the What We Heard Report: How Research and Consultation Shaped the Engagement Framework .
5	Paper Survey Karratha Library	50-59yrs	Scottish	No comment	Changes: No Response: only completed statement 'Agree-Disagree' rating questions
6	Paper Survey Karratha Library	40-49yrs	New Zealand	<i>"The Local input and building community appears to be minimal as it appears to be only set bodies to provide input . Is this the new way of access grants?"</i>	Changes: No Response: Concern addressed by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Step 2 of how we plan and conduct engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Understand who is affected and how to communicate with and involve them This is not limited to set bodies/groups or related to accessing grants.
7	Paper Survey Karratha Library	80-89yrs	English	<i>"Your Draft Engagement guidelines appear to be very achievable in a unrealistic way. It feels like AI is involved. Expecting staff to co-operate in this way is totally unrealistic, you may have a staff member who is dedicated to achieving all that is required by many fail and move on"</i>	Changes: No Response: Draft Engagement Guidelines were informed by extensive research and consultation and were not generated by AI. For further information see:

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What We Heard Report: How Research and Consultation Shaped the Engagement Framework. <p>This document also details</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement Framework goals and actions, including development of a training program for staff members, integrated systems, tools and templates to support planning, delivery and evaluation of engagement activities.
8	Paper Survey Karratha Library	70-79yrs	Australian	<p><i>“Quiet voices matter - but often unheard. Engagement Takes Time! Years sometimes. Too much engagement can be Tiring! to the point of disengagement. Not everyone is online, not everyone gets to see notice boards, goes to the library, the shops or the Leisureplex, etc”</i></p>	<p>Changes: No</p> <p>Response: Feedback understood and addressed in the Draft Engagement Guidelines, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What do we want to do better? (Page 7) Step 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand who is affected and how to communicate with an involve them.
9	Workshop	40-49yrs	Australian (Dampier Resident)	<p><i>“Great work, keep it up! The City has a good track record of trying.”</i></p> <p><i>“Make it clearer that steps 1 to 4 are the responsibility of the City and that steps 5 and 6 is when the community can get involved.”</i></p>	<p>Changes: No</p> <p>Response: Appreciative of acknowledgment and encouragement.</p> <p>Changes: Yes</p> <p>Response: We will add ‘who is responsible’ for each of the steps</p>

				<p><i>“There is a balance. We don’t want to see the City spending more time and resources engaging than delivering the project or outcome.”</i></p> <p><i>“What if we have a lot more general community members compared with business owners with different priorities? How does the City decide or balance competing priorities from different segments of our external stakeholders? During the caravan park feasibility study in Dampier, the community had ‘more voices’ who were against a caravan park in Dampier as they didn’t want more itinerants or tourists in town. But business owners want more tourists to make their businesses more viable/profitable, which would attract more businesses and give community more options. Who’s priority is more important? How does the City weight competing priorities?”</i></p> <p><i>“Also, how do we grapple with investment in improving the sewerage capacity - short term large cost, leaving till longer term, cost increases, and growth is not enabled.”</i></p>	<p>that describe <i>How we plan and conduct engagement</i></p> <p>Changes: No Response: The City’s Knowledge Bank (page 10) is designed to address over-engagement.</p> <p>Changes: No Response: The Draft Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy CS24 acknowledges the intention is “to embed a strong foundation for organisation-led Engagement practice and culture at the City of Karratha to support transparent and evidence-based decision-making, build Community and Stakeholder trust, and ensure outcomes reflect the diverse needs and aspirations of the Community we serve.”</p> <p>The What We Heard Report: How Research and Consultation Shaped the Engagement Framework describes the role of Engagement within an evidence-based decision-making model, which also includes consideration of the context of the decision, available research/data, and subject-matter expertise.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

10	Workshop	40-49yrs	Australian (Karratha Resident)	<p><i>“Good flow, clear, easy to understand. It sounds like common sense.”</i></p> <p><i>“Step 6 needs to be two discreet activities - Sharing what we heard and did we get it right is really important because we could be ill advising decision-makers without this step.”</i></p> <p><i>“Stakeholder Identification is also important. Ask other stakeholders to ensure we have covered all stakeholders. The City really needs to understand how to reach who may be affected by a decision.”</i></p>	<p>Changes: No Response: Appreciative of positive feedback.</p> <p>Changes: No Response: Step 6 includes the action of asking if we got an outcome right. In practice this can be shared via Meeting Minutes, What We Heard Report, draft plan/strategy document open for feedback, and concept designs. This practice will also be supported through provision of training and an Engagement Toolkit to City of Karratha staff.</p> <p>Changes: No Response: The Engagement Toolkit available to staff will provide staff with tactics to assist them in identifying who may be affected by a City of Karratha decision, project, or outcome.</p>
11	Paper Survey Karratha Library	40-49yrs	New Zealand	<p><i>“Updating the existing facilities to include the community.”</i></p>	<p>Changes: No Response: Unable to directly link feedback to the Draft Engagement Guidelines. Principle No. 2 Inclusive, Equitable and Culturally Respectful addresses need to include the community when updating existing facilities.</p>

12	Paper Survey Roebourne Pop-Up	20-29yrs	Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander and English	<i>"Engage with Ngarluma & Yindjibarndi & Banjima language translators."</i>	<p>Changes: No</p> <p>Response: Appreciative of feedback received. Currently addressed in Draft Engagement Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Step 2: Get ready by making sure we have everything we need to engage well will include consideration of language and the need for translation services. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City had an outdoor banner and online content translated into Ngarluma and Yindjibarndi languages to communicate local government elections in October 2025. More culturally sensitive and inclusive practices will continue to grow as the Engagement Framework is implemented 2026-2030.
13	Paper-Survey Wickham Library	20-29yrs	Australian	<i>"So far the city has not taken into account residents voices. It is hard to take the city at their word"</i>	<p>Changes: No</p> <p>Response: We acknowledge this experience and have validated in the Draft Engagement Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do we want to do better? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not everyone agrees – sometimes, Council decisions may differ from what some people want, and we need to handle this openly and respectfully.

14	Paper Survey Wickham Library	30- 39yrs	African	No comment	Changes: No Response: only completed statement 'Agree-Disagree' rating questions
----	---------------------------------------	--------------	---------	------------	---