

SHARK BAY TERRESTRIAL RESERVES AND PROPOSED RESERVE ADDITIONS

Analysis of Public Submissions

to the

Draft Management Plan (2007)

Department of Environment and Conservation

for the

Conservation Commission of Western Australia

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 2. NUMBERS OF SUBMISSIONS | 3 |
| 3. ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS | 3 |
| Summary of Comments | 3 |
| Submission Analysis | 5 |
| 4. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS | 8 |
| General Comments | 8 |
| PART A: INTRODUCTION | 10 |
| 1. Brief Overview | 10 |
| 2. Regional Context | 10 |
| 3. Planning Area | 10 |
| 4. Key Values | 10 |
| 5. Public Participation | 10 |
| 6. Vision | 10 |
| 7. Legislative Framework | 11 |
| 8. Management Arrangements with Indigenous People | 11 |
| 9. Management Planning Process | 13 |
| 10. Performance Assessment | 13 |
| 11. Land Tenure | 13 |
| 12. Existing and Proposed Tenure | 13 |
| PART C: MANAGING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT | 16 |
| Introduction/General | 16 |
| 13. Biogeography | 17 |
| 14. Wilderness | 17 |
| 15. Climate and Climate Change | 17 |
| 17. Hydrology and Catchment Protection | 18 |
| 18. Native Plants and Vegetation Associations | 18 |
| 19. Native Animals | 19 |
| 20. Ecological Communities | 20 |
| 21. Environmental Weeds | 20 |
| 22. Introduced and Other Problem Animals | 22 |
| 23. Diseases | 22 |
| 24. Fire | 23 |
| PART D: MANAGING OUR CULTURAL HERITAGE | 23 |
| General Comments | 23 |
| 25. Heritage Legislation and Policy Framework | 23 |
| 26. Indigenous Heritage | 24 |
| 27. Non-Indigenous Heritage | 25 |
| PART E: MANAGING VISITOR USE | 26 |
| Introduction/General | 26 |
| 28. Recreation Use Planning | 26 |
| 29. Recreation and Tourism Opportunities | 26 |
| 30. Visitor Access | 28 |
| 31. Visual Landscape | 29 |
| 32. Recreation Activities and Use | 29 |
| 32.1 - Recreational Activities and Use - Wildlife Encounters | 29 |
| 32.2 - Recreational Activities and Use - Scenic and Recreational Driving | 29 |
| 32.3 - Recreational Activities and Use - Overnight Stays | 29 |
| 32.4 - Recreational Activities and Use - Day-Use | 30 |
| 32.5 - Recreational Activities and Use - Bushwalking | 30 |
| 32.6 - Recreational Activities - Recreational Fishing | 30 |
| 32.7 - Recreational Activities - Recreational Boating | 30 |
| 32.8 - Recreational Activities - Water-based Activities | 31 |
| 32.9 - Recreational Activities - Scenic Flights and Other Aircraft | 31 |
| 32.10 - Recreational Activities - Non-commercial, Education and Not-for-Profit Groups | 31 |
| 32.11 - Recreational Activities - Special Events | 31 |
| 33. Tourism and Commercial Operations | 31 |
| 34. Visitor Safety | 32 |
| 35. Domestic Animals | 32 |
| 36. Bernier, Dorre and Koks Islands | 32 |
| 36.1 Bernier, Dorre and Koks Islands - Visitor Access | 32 |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of
Public Submissions

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 37. Shark Bay Islands | 34 |
| 38. Peron Peninsula | 34 |
| 38.1 Peron Peninsula - Recreation and Tourism Opportunities | 34 |
| 38.2 Peron Peninsula - Access | 34 |
| 38.3 Peron Peninsula - Recreation Use and Activities - Overnight Stays | 34 |
| 38.4 Peron Peninsula - Tourism and Commercial Opportunities | 35 |
| 38.5 Peron Peninsula - Domestic Animals | 35 |
| 39. Nanga Peninsula | 35 |
| 40. Zuytdorp Area | 35 |
| 40.1 - Zuytdorp Area - Access | 35 |
| 40.2 - Zuytdorp Area - Recreation Use and Activities | 35 |
| 41. Edel Land | 35 |
| 41.1 - Edel Land - Recreation and Tourism Opportunities | 35 |
| 41.2 - Edel Land - Visitor Access | 36 |
| 41.3 - Edel Land - Recreation Use and Activities - Overnight Stays | 39 |
| 41.3 - Edel Land - Recreation Use and Activities - Recreational Fishing | 39 |
| 41.4 - Edel Land - Visitor Safety | 39 |
| 41.5 - Edel Land - Tourism and Commercial Operations | 39 |
| 41.6 - Edel Land - Domestic Animals | 39 |
| 42. Dirk Hartog Island | 39 |
| 42.1 Dirk Hartog Island - Visitor Access | 41 |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Wildlife Encounters | 43 |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Scenic and Recreational Driving | 43 |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Overnight Stays | 43 |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Day-Use | 44 |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Bushwalking | 45 |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Recreational Fishing | 45 |
| 42.3 - Dirk Hartog Island - Tourism and Commercial Opportunities | 45 |
| 42.4 - Dirk Hartog Island - Visitor Safety | 45 |
| 42.5 - Dirk Hartog Island - Domestic Animals | 45 |
| PART F: MANAGING RESOURCE USE | 45 |
| Introduction/General | 45 |
| 43. Traditional Hunting and Gathering | 46 |
| 44. Mineral and Petroleum Exploration and Development | 46 |
| 45. Basic Raw Materials | 49 |
| 46. Rehabilitation | 51 |
| 47. Commercial Fishing | 52 |
| 48. Water Extraction | 52 |
| 49. Pollution and Waste Management | 52 |
| 50. Defence, Emergency and Other Training | 52 |
| 51. Public Utilities and Services | 52 |
| 52. Scientific and Research Use | 53 |
| PART G: INVOLVING THE COMMUNITY | 53 |
| 53. Community Education and Interpretation | 53 |
| 54. Community Involvement and Volunteers | 53 |
| PART H: MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN | 53 |
| 55. Administration | 53 |
| 56. Research and Monitoring | 53 |
| 57. Term of the Plan | 53 |
| GLOSSARY, ACRONYMS, REFERENCES AND PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS | 53 |
| APPENDICES | 53 |
| Appendix 5 - Weed species within the planning area | 53 |
| MAPS | 54 |
| REFERENCES | 54 |

1. Introduction

This document is an analysis of public submissions (APS) to the Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserves and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 (the Plan).

The Plan was released for public comment on Wednesday 30th April for a period of two months, closing on Monday 7th July 2008. Late submissions were accepted. A total of 42 public submissions were received. All submissions have been summarised and changes have been made to the Plan where appropriate.

Following the release of the Plan, advertisements were placed in two issues of the local newspapers and two issues of *The West Australian*, advising that the Plan was available for comment. The Plan was distributed to State Government departments, tertiary institutions, recreation and conservation groups, local authorities, libraries and other community groups and individuals who expressed interest during the preparation of the draft. The Plan was available for viewing and/or downloading from the Department of Environment and Conservation's (the Department's) NatureBase website, from which electronic submissions could be made. Printed copies of the Plan were made available at the Department's offices in Kensington, Geraldton, Denham and Carnarvon. The Plan could be inspected at Department's libraries at Woodvale and the City of Geraldton-Greenough Public Library, the Carnarvon Public Library and the Shire of Shark Bay office.

2. Numbers of Submissions

A total of 42 submissions were received and these were considered during the APS (Table 4). The comments made in each submission were collated according to the section of the Plan they addressed.

Of all the submissions received, the largest percentage were received from State Government Departments (40.5%), closely followed by other organisations (38.1%) (Table 1).

Submitters to the *Draft Management Plan for the Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserves and Proposed Reserve Additions* are listed in Appendix 1.

Table 1: Number and Origin of Submissions

| Category | Number | Percentage |
|---------------------|-----------|------------|
| Individuals | 6 | 14.3 |
| Federal Government | 2 | 4.7 |
| State Government | 17 | 40.5 |
| Local Government | 1 | 2.4 |
| Other Organisations | 16 | 38.1 |
| Total | 42 | 100 |

3. Analysis of Submissions

Summary of Comments

Most of the public submissions received made comments about a variety of issues. In the first instance, all submissions were collated into a table for analysis (Table 4). Comments were summarised based on what the purpose of the comment was (i.e. supports, concerned, suggests, advises, prefers, congratulated, questions, does not support, applauds, wants, seeks or acknowledges) and what the main point of the comment was.

In total 345 comments were received on the Plan. The greatest number of comments received (33.6%) were associated with issues to do with the largest part of the plan, 'Managing Visitor Use' (Table 2). 'Management Directions and Purpose' and 'Managing the Natural Environment' and 'Managing

Resource Use’ were also parts of the Plan that received relatively high numbers of comments (11.9%, 18.8% and 17.4% respectively).

Table 2: Number of comments on parts of the draft management plan

| Chapter (Part) | Number |
|--|---------------|
| General | 16 |
| Part A. Introduction | 2 |
| Part B. Management Directions and Purpose | 41 |
| Part C. Managing the Natural Environment | 65 |
| Part D. Managing Our Cultural Heritage | 19 |
| Part E. Managing Visitor Use | 116 |
| Part F. Managing Resource Use | 60 |
| Part G. Involving the Community | 0 |
| Part H. Monitoring and Implementing the Plan | 3 |
| Appendices, maps and other parts of the Plan | 23 |
| Total | 345 |

In terms of more specific sections of the draft plan, most comments received were for the sections on: Existing and Proposed Tenure; Environmental Weeds; Edel Land; Dirk Hartog Island; Mineral and Petroleum Exploration and Development and Basic Raw Materials.

Table 3: Number of comments on sections of the draft management plan.

| Section | Number |
|--|---------------|
| Invitation to Comment, Preface, Acknowledgements, Nomenclature | 4 |
| 1. Brief Overview | 0 |
| 2. Regional Context | 1 |
| 3. Planning Area | 0 |
| 4. Key Values | 1 |
| 5. Public Participation | 0 |
| 6. Vision | 2 |
| 7. Legislative Framework | 8 |
| 8. Management Arrangements with Aboriginal People | 9 |
| 9. Management Planning Process | 0 |
| 10. Performance Assessment | 0 |
| 11. Land Tenure | 0 |
| 12. Existing and Proposed Tenure | 22 |
| 13. Biogeography | 2 |
| 14. Wilderness | 2 |
| 15. Climate and Climate Change | 1 |
| 16. Geology, Geomorphology and Soils | 3 |
| 17. Hydrology and Catchment Protection | 0 |
| 18. Native Plants and Vegetation Associations | 9 |
| 19. Native Animals | 12 |
| 20. Ecological Communities | 0 |
| 21. Environmental Weeds | 19 |
| 22. Introduced and Problem Animals | 7 |
| 23. Diseases | 2 |
| 24. Fire | 8 |
| 25. Heritage Legislation and Framework | 5 |
| 26. Indigenous Heritage | 8 |

| Section | Number |
|---|------------|
| 27. Non-Indigenous Heritage | 5 |
| 28. Recreation Use Planning | 0 |
| 29. Recreation and Tourism Opportunities | 7 |
| 30. Visitor Access | 7 |
| 31. Visual Landscape | 1 |
| 32. Recreation Use and Activities | 13 |
| 33. Tourism and Commercial Operations | 1 |
| 34. Visitor Safety | 1 |
| 35. Domestic Animals | 1 |
| 36. Bernier, Dorre and Koks Islands | 4 |
| 37. Shark Bay Islands | 0 |
| 38. Peron Peninsula | 6 |
| 39. Nanga Peninsula | 0 |
| 40. Zuytdorp Area | 2 |
| 41. Edel Land | 32 |
| 42. Dirk Hartog Island | 38 |
| 43. Traditional Hunting and Gathering | 2 |
| 44. Mineral and Petroleum Exploration and Development | 23 |
| 45. Basic Raw Materials | 25 |
| 46. Rehabilitation | 3 |
| 47. Commercial Fishing | 0 |
| 48. Water Extraction | 3 |
| 49. Pollution and Waste Management | 0 |
| 50. Defence, Emergency and Other Training | 0 |
| 51. Public Utilities and Services | 2 |
| 52. Scientific and Research Use | 0 |
| 53. Community Education and Interpretation | 0 |
| 54. Community Involvement and Volunteers | 0 |
| 55. Administration | 3 |
| 56. Research and Monitoring | 0 |
| 57. Term of the Plan | 0 |
| Glossaries | 0 |
| References and Personal Communications | 1 |
| Appendices | 18 |
| Maps | 0 |
| General | 22 |
| Total | 345 |

Submission Analysis

Each comment on the *Draft Management Plan for the Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserves and Proposed Reserve Additions* was analysed according to the process depicted in the flow chart (Figure 1). For each comment, the analysis table (Table 4), was amended with information on:

- ❖ whether or not the point resulted in an amendment to the final plan;
- ❖ the criteria by which each point was assessed; and
- ❖ why the point did not result in an amendment to the final plan, or an indication of what action was taken in the final plan.


Each comment made was assessed using the following criteria:

1. The draft management plan *will* be amended if a submission:

- a. provides additional information of direct relevance to management;
 - b. provides additional information on affected user groups of direct relevance to management;
 - c. indicates a change in (or clarifies) Government legislation, management commitment or management policy;
 - d. proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives; or
 - e. indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity.
2. The draft management plan *will not* be amended if a submission:
- a. clearly supports statements in the plan;
 - b. makes a general statement and no change is sought;
 - c. makes statements already in the plan or were considered during the plan preparation;
 - d. addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan;
 - e. is one amongst several widely divergent viewpoints received on the topic and the strategies of the plan are still considered the best option;
 - f. contributes options that are not feasible (generally due to conflict with existing legislation, Government policy, lack of resource capacity or lack of research knowledge to make decisions);
 - g. was based on unclear or factually incorrect information; or
 - h. provides details that are not appropriate or necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long term.

Comments made in submissions have been assessed entirely on the cogency of points raised. No subjective weighting has been given to any submission for reasons of its origin or any other factor that would give cause to elevate the importance of any submission above another.

FIGURE 1 - ANALYSIS PROCESS



4. Summary of Public Submissions

| Comment No | Summary of Comment | Criteria | Discussion/Action taken | Plan Amended |
|-------------------------|---|----------|---|--------------|
| General Comments | | | | |
| 1 | Concerned about a lack of adequate consultation prior to the release of the draft and suggest that some of the recommendations contained in the draft plan are poorly researched. | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment based on unclear or factually incorrect information. During the preparation of the draft management plan, the submitter was sent a copy of the issues paper, a "Have Your Say" brochure and invited to make a submission before the release of the draft plan or to contact DEC to become involved in the process in some other way. The submitter did not take up this opportunity. | No |
| 2 | The above has been resolved in relation to DEC's marine planning with the establishment of a stakeholder reference group, but continues to be an issue in relation to DEC's terrestrial planning process. Suggests that such a group be established for terrestrial park planning. | 2 (f) | Noted. Comment contributes options that are not feasible. The range of stakeholders for terrestrial planning processes is much greater than for marine processes and there are a different key stakeholders for each different planning area. Consequently, the establishment of a stakeholder reference group to be involved with all terrestrial management plans would not be effective. Community Advisory Committees are often formed in the development of management plans for terrestrial reserves and such a committee was established for the development of this plan. | No |
| 3 | The draft management plan is comprehensive and thorough as befits a plan for a World Heritage listed area. It recognises the need for management decisions under many of the environmental and biotic threatening processes such as climate change and exotic predators. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 4 | The draft plan is very comprehensive and includes many topics of interest to recreational fishermen in the area. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes a general statement and no change is sought | No |
| 5 | Generally supports the intention of these management plans to manage these areas for sustainable use and for future generations. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 6 | Suggests that certain details of exactly what will be done within some of the generally agreed intentions are hidden. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. For an area as large as Shark Bay, it is not possible to provide this level of detail in a management plan and, in most cases, this detail has not yet been established. Detailed planning and associated public consultation occurs as part of the site development planning process which occurs when individual sites are developed. No intentions have been hidden. | No |
| 7 | The draft management plan is comprehensive and, through implementation, will help to ensure the protection and sustainable use of the area's high quality attractions and visitor access to these attractions is critical to the tourism industry. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes a general statement and no change is sought | No |
| 8 | Does not object to the objectives set out in the draft plan. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 9 | Supports the maintenance of maximum possible access for sport and recreation participants. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements in the plan or considered during plan preparation. Access for sport and recreation is considered in Part E - Managing Visitor Use. | No |
| 10 | Supports the development of the plan and DEC in providing opportunities for recreation in these Nature Reserves, National Parks and Conservation Parks. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 11 | Suggests that the plan is comprehensive in its content and context and ensure that the existing and proposed reserves cater for demand for public recreation that is consistent with the conservation of the natural environment, flora and fauna and features of archaeological, historic or | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---------------|--|----|
| | scientific interest. | | | |
| 12 | Suggests that issues regarding future developments in the Shark Bay World Heritage Area be discussed where relevant. | 2 (c) and (d) | Noted. Comment makes statements in the plan or considered during plan preparation and addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. This management plan considers the impacts of future developments in DEC managed reserves in the Shark Bay World Heritage Property. Proposed developments in the remainder of the World Heritage Property and their impacts on World Heritage values are outlined in the <i>Shark Bay World Heritage Property Strategic Plan 2008-2020</i> . | No |
| 13 | Suggests that, while many of the policy measures of the State Planning Policy No. 2.6 State Coastal Planning Policy and the Development Control Policy DC6.1 Country Coastal Planning Policy, issues raised in this submission are considered to be not addressed in sufficient detail or are inconsistent with these policies. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements in the plan or considered during plan preparation and addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. NOTE: Reference to these policies already in plan in most appropriate section. | No |
| 14 | Suggests that the plan was easily obtained, easy to understand, covered the main management issues and contained sufficient information to draw conclusions. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 15 | Congratulates DEC in completing the plan, which has taken several years of work. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 16 | Supports opportunities to contribute towards strengthening partnerships with other World Heritage managers within Australia. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes a neutral statement and no change is sought. | No |
| Invitation to Comment | | | | |
| 17 | Suggests that the review of the plan and the "Invitation to Comment" is very prescriptive. Concerned about the criteria that plan will not be amended if a submission, "makes statements...which were considered during plan preparation" or "strategies of the plan are still considered the best option." This does not give confidence that good, reasoned and rational comments will be considered on their merits. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes a general statement and no change is sought. The merits of all submissions, especially those with reasoned arguments are fully considered in the analysis process and the discussion point/action taken component of this table describes why or why not the plan has been changed as a result of a submission. The criteria that the plan will not be amended because a submission, "makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation," usually applies when what the submitter is suggesting has been covered somewhere in the management plan. If it applies to something that has been considered during the preparation of the plan, this will be described in the Discussion/Action Taken column of this table. Likewise when the plan is not changed because the submission, "is amongst several divergent viewpoints and the strategies described in the plan are still considered the best option.", the Discussion/Action Taken column will describe why the plan has not been changed as a result of the submission. | No |
| 18 | Acknowledges that prior opportunity to comment during the planning process was given to the submitter. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes a general statement and no change is sought. | No |
| 19 | Suggests that, the draft plan contains extra detail not yet seen, and, given the criteria used to analyse submissions and amend the plan, that changes to the draft management plan will be difficult. Also suggests that the plan can be amended by DEC or the Government without further consultation or further opportunity to comment on new changes. Suggests that, although this process is in accordance with the CALM Act, this is a significant flaw in DEC's terrestrial planning process. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. As submitter states, the process is in accord with the CALM Act. The criteria used to analyse submissions have been developed and applied over many years. The process is robust and inclusive from the pre-draft information gathering, preparation of the draft management plan, analysis of the submissions to the final management plan. | No |
| 20 | Advises that similar concerns raised in comment number 19 were raised in relation to marine park planning and subsequently saw the creation of a stakeholder reference group, which includes a recreational fishing representative. Suggests that a similar group should be established for terrestrial planning to avoid some of these problems. | 2 (f) | Noted. Comment contributes options that are not feasible. The range of stakeholders for terrestrial planning processes is much greater than for marine processes and there are a different key stakeholders for each different planning area. Consequently, the establishment of a stakeholder reference group to be involved with all terrestrial management plans would not be effective. In | No |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------|---|-----|
| | | | addition, recreational fishing is not an issue for all planning areas. Community Advisory Committees are often formed in the development of management plans for terrestrial reserves and such a committee was established for the development of this plan. Several members on this committee were represented both commercial and recreational fishing interests. | |
| PART A: INTRODUCTION | | | | |
| 1. Brief Overview | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 2. Regional Context | | | | |
| 21 | Suggests that the following paragraph be added to page 4 to ensure the geothermal energy potential of the area is clearly stated, "The Geological Survey division of the Department of Industry and Resources has undertaken a series of studies entitled "Geothermal Energy Potential in Selected Areas of Western Australia." These studies aim to locate high potential "Hot Rock" (HR) resources for future geothermal energy developments. The onshore Carnarvon Basin , which includes the Shark Bay terrestrial area, was part of the study and findings indicate that the geological structure of the region is prospective for geothermal resources. However, the study was limited by an absence of temperature data for the Shark Bay area. Therefore, access for exploration will be necessary in order to determine the full extent of the area's potential to become a source of safe, secure, competitively-priced emission free and renewable base load power." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Information about geothermal energy potential added to the plan, although text changed to "...Therefore, access for exploration <u>may</u> be necessary in order to determine the full extent of the area's potential to become a source of safe, secure, competitively-priced emission free and renewable base load power. Any exploration will be subject to the standard approvals process." This information is better placed in Section 16 - <i>Geology, Geomorphology and Soils</i> , with a cross-reference in Section 44 - <i>Mineral and Petroleum Exploration and Development</i> . NOTE: Section 2 lists existing industry information, not potential so no need for this information to be included. | No |
| 3. Planning Area | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 4. Key Values | | | | |
| 22 | Suggests that, Criterion 4 of the World Heritage values, the Baudin Island skink, woma python and sandhill frog are not threatened. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The sandhill frog is not threatened under the Wildlife Conservation Act, so has been removed as a dot point. However, the Baudin Island spiny tailed skink and the woma python are listed as vulnerable and specially protected respectively under the Wildlife Conservation Act, so will remain on this list. | Yes |
| 5. Public Participation | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| PART B: MANAGEMENT DIRECTIONS AND PURPOSE | | | | |
| 6. Vision | | | | |
| 23 | Strongly agree with the spirit of this section, in particular reference to "cooperative management, community involvement and commercial opportunities." Suggests that community "involvement" is replaced with community "engagement" as mitigative and adaptive responses to climate change will require greater willingness and responsibility by the community to play a more active role in planning and management. | 2 (e) | Noted. Comment is one of several viewpoints and the strategies of the plan are still considered the best option. The word "involvement" is a broader, more inclusive term than "engagement". | No |
| 24 | Supports the vision for the planning area. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |

| 7. Legislative Framework | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|---|-----|
| 25 | Advises that, under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, actions (which can include a project, development, activity or series of activities) that are likely to have a significant impact on matters of National Environmental Significance (NES) require assessment and approval by the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts, in addition to State Government approval. These include World Heritage Properties, National Heritage Places, Ramsar wetlands, listed threatened species and ecological communities, migratory species listed under international agreements, Commonwealth marine environments and nuclear actions. Given that the planning area contains a number of matters of NES, actions in the draft management plan should be referred to the Commonwealth Minister for a decision on assessment and approval under the EPBC Act. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes a statement already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. The requirements to refer actions and consult with the Commonwealth Minister are outlined in this section. | No |
| 26 | Suggests that the Department consults a copy of the Commonwealth Department of Environment and Water Resources recently revised significant impact guidelines (found at www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications/nas-guidelines.html) | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. This information is too detailed for a management plan. However, this information will be passed onto Midwest Regional and Shark Bay District staff for their information. | No |
| 27 | Advises that the EPBC Act contains mechanisms that allow the Commonwealth Minister to endorse a plan or a policy where he is satisfied that it adequately addresses potential impacts on matters of NES. This potentially reduces the need for case by case referral of proposed developments that are consistent with the endorsed plan, policy or program. | 2 (d) | Comment addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. This information is too detailed for a management plan. However, on completion, the management plan will be sent to the Commonwealth Minister for his information. | No |
| 28 | Suggests that the plan needs to acknowledge the legislative provisions of the <i>Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Resources Act 1967</i> (WA) which is administered by the Department of Industry and Resources. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Information about this act added to the plan. | Yes |
| 29 | Suggests that the plan should make reference to the State Planning Policy No. 2 Environment and Natural Resources Policy as it defines sound and responsible planning of environment and natural resource issues within the State Planning Strategy Framework | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Information about this policy added to the plan. | Yes |
| 30 | Advises that the State Planning Policy No. 2.6 State Coastal Planning Policy guides coastal planning in Western Australia and that the Country Coastal Planning Policy is viewed in light of the State Coastal Planning Policy. Suggests that incorporation of this policy into the plan will ensure that development is compatible and complementary with the local environment and adequate coastal management practices are implemented. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements in the plan or considered during plan preparation. Reference to State Planning Policy No. 2.6 State Coastal Planning Policy is made in Section 7 - Legislative Framework and its relevance to the planning area. | No |
| 31 | Advises that the Shire of Shark Bay Town Planning Scheme 3 has recently been approved and suggests that the plan clarifies how it relates to this and whether the implementation of this needs to be addressed. Suggests that DEC contact the Shire of Shark Bay regarding any changes to the LPS to ensure zonings are consistent with the management plan. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Reference to the Shark Bay Town Planning Scheme No. 3 updated and the Department will liaise with the Shire of Shark Bay regarding the Town Planning Scheme No.3 to ensure consistency. The Shire of Shark Bay has not developed a Local Planning Scheme. | Yes |
| 32 | Suggests that the last sentence of the third paragraph be changed to, "Twenty-four bird species found in the planning area are listed ROKAMBA." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Sentence corrected. | Yes |
| 8. Management Arrangements with Indigenous People | | | | |
| 33 | Questions the land claim over the islands as Aboriginal people had no water craft and did not access Dirk Hartog, Bernier or Dorre Islands. Any | 2 (c) and 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan and makes statements already in the plan or were considered during plan preparation. The establishment of | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|----|---|-------|--|-----|
| | artefacts would represent occupation pre-dating the formation of the islands or presence linked with European settlers/visitors. | | native title claim areas is the decision of native title working groups or bodies that represent Aboriginal people who speak for that country. This is not the responsibility of the Department. The draft management plan acknowledges that Aboriginal people did occupy the islands prior to European settlement in Section 26 - <i>Indigenous Heritage</i> . | |
| 34 | Refers to the consultation paper released by the State Government in 2003 regarding joint management arrangements with traditional custodians. Suggests that no formal policy regarding joint management arrangements has been released by the State Government. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes a statement already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. The plan states that the State Government is still working towards the development of a policy and possible amendments to the CALM Act to enable joint management arrangements on conservation reserves regardless of the status of native title. | No |
| 35 | Acknowledges that the plan contains a number of positive statements about DEC's intention or willingness to consult with local Indigenous people about the management of the planning area. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports statements in the plan. | No |
| 36 | Suggests that the plan does not provide specific mechanisms by which consultation and liaison with Indigenous people takes place and that this will result in consultation not occurring. Suggests that the term consultation be defined in the management plan and does not consider the release of the draft management plan for public comment as consultation with Traditional Owners. Advises that consultation with native title claim groups is usually done at working group meetings. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. Information about how consultation will be carried out with Indigenous people is too detailed for a management plan. DEC acknowledges and supports consultation with native title claim groups through working group meetings. Consultation may also involve other forms of consultation outside of working group meetings and the plan needs to be flexible enough to provide for this. Notification of plan meets statutory requirements. | No |
| 37 | Suggests that the lack of development of a final policy on joint management arrangements with Traditional Owners should not prevent a concrete process of consultation being developed and that consideration should be given to a form of cooperative management similar to what is used at Karijini and Purnululu National Parks. Suggests that the establishment of a Park Council for the Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserves be considered with significant representation of the Malgana claim group be considered, to allow for the continued taking of flora and fauna for food and ceremonial purposes to negotiate with DEC and the Conservation Commission regarding the establishment of living areas within the planning area. | 1(b) | Noted. Comment provides additional information on affected user groups of direct relevance to management. Information on the formation of a Park Council dependent on adequate resourcing from Government and level of local support for its establishment and operation was added to the plan. | Yes |
| 38 | Suggests the establishment of living areas for Traditional Owners within the planning area. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The process of determination of native title may identify appropriate areas for Aboriginal occupation. This has been added to the plan. | Yes |
| 39 | Concerned that the conversion of areas of pastoral lease to conservation estate will limit the ability of Malgana and Nanda people to exercise native title rights and interests, including traditional activities such as hunting and gathering. The CALM Regulations restrict the ability of Malgana and Nanda people to exercise native title rights on conservation lands, in particular in relation to carrying and discharging firearms, using traps and snares, cleaning and scaling fish, taking water, lighting campfires and using vehicles. Given that, with the proposed land tenure changes, the area of proposed DEC-managed land will be more than 500 000 hectares, this could significantly limit the rights of the Malgana and Nanda claim groups. Suggests that the development of a negotiated and agreed ILUA would enable Malgana and Nanda people to exercise native title rights and protect the values of the conservation estate. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The planning area is subject to existing legislation, including the Native Title Act and, at the time of writing, the management plan is consistent with this Act. The Department is currently investigating the development of an ILUA to create reserve additions that retain the rights and interests of native title claimants. The Department uses the CALM Regulations to manage public safety and biodiversity conservation and are not designed to restrict activities, including Aboriginal native title rights. This information has been added to the plan. | Yes |
| 40 | Suggests that the reference to Henri Freycinet Bay in the last sentence of the second paragraph be changed to Henri Freycinet Harbour. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Sentence corrected. | Yes |
| 41 | Concerned there is a tendency for government agencies to use terms such as | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. In 2003, | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------|--|-----|
| | "joint management" for arrangements which could be better described as "co-operative management" or "consultative arrangement". "Consultation" is also a broad term to describe a range of possible activities. Suggests that failing to define or agree on these terms can cause confusion and create expectations of "joint decision making" which government agencies may be unable or unwilling to fulfil. | | the Department released the consultation paper, "Indigenous Ownership and Joint Management of Conservation Lands in Western Australia.", which defines three approaches to co-management arrangements of protected areas. These include: a) Consultative management (non Aboriginal vested reserves) whereby ownership (reserved Crown lands) is held by the Conservation Commission of Western Australia or the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority with planning and management arrangements amended to secure the rights of Aboriginal people to practice their traditions and customs, and manage Aboriginal heritage sites in accordance with the State law; b) Cooperative management (Aboriginal vested reserves) whereby ownership of conservation lands is held by an approved Aboriginal Body Corporate (ABC) which represents the Traditional Owners of the area. A management order is granted on the condition that the Department and the ABC jointly manage the area for the purpose of a national park or conservation reserve, for example; and c) joint management (Aboriginal freehold lands) whereby ownership (inalienable freehold) of conservation lands is held by an approved ABC which represents Traditional Owners of the area. An agreement, normally a 99-year lease, with an option would be reached to enable the ABC and the Department to jointly manage the area for the purpose of national park or other conservation reserve for example. These definitions have been included in the glossary of the management plan. | |
| 9. Management Planning Process | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 10. Performance Assessment | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 11. Land Tenure | | | | |
| 42 | Questions the legal basis for allowing "Some low impact recreation that does not harm natural ecosystems..." in the management objective for a nature reserve in Table 1. | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment was based on unclear or factually incorrect information. Low impact recreation relates to the appreciation of the natural values of a nature reserve and the Department has received legal advice that this is consistent with the purpose of a nature reserve. The statement, "To maintain and restore the natural environment to protect, care for and promote the study of indigenous flora and fauna, and to preserve any feature of archaeological, historic or scientific interest." comes from the CALM Act. The statement, "Some low impact recreation that does not harm natural ecosystems is allowed." has been added for clarity." | No |
| 12. Existing and Proposed Tenure | | | | |
| 43 | Refers to the inclusion of ex-Nanga Station and part ex-Tamala Station in the Zuytdorp Nature Reserve, this being a recommended tenure changes in the 1997 WA Planning Commission Shark Bay Regional Strategy. Questions if the inclusion of these areas in the Zuytdorp Nature Reserve will preclude mineral exploration and mining. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The text in this section to reflect the proposed tenure in the final management plan will be consistent with the Cabinet Decision of September 2007 regarding reserving of former pastoral leases. Map 2 will be changed to show the changes. The impacts of tenure on mining and mineral exploration are outlined in Section 44 - <i>Mineral and Petroleum Exploration and Development</i> . | Yes |
| 44 | Does not support the vesting of Reserve 14918 with the Shire of Shark Bay because of, a) inconsistencies with the Shark Bay Strategic Plan, b) if well managed, it would attract tourism development interest, c) there is the potential for indirect benefits for the Shark Bay community in relation to | | DEC will continue to work with the Shire of Shark Bay and other State Government agencies regarding the future vesting and management of Reserve 14918. | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|----|---|-------|---|-----|
| | the development of sustainable and cultural tourism and other positive regional benefits, d) mismanagement of the reserve would lead to benefits being shared by only a small handful of individuals, e) maximising the opportunities of this reserve would require a cross-boundary approach with a real commitment to community engagement and cooperative management, f) the Shire does not have the resources, structure or functioning to manage the reserve and g) the history of management arrangements at Monkey Mia. Suggests that a paragraph be added to the plan, "DEC will continue to work with the State Government to develop innovative tenure and management arrangements for the Reserve that respect its unique character and maximise its social and economic potential while conserving its environmental and cultural values." | | | |
| 45 | Suggests the extension and the identification of Denham's town boundary south of the 26th Parallel. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. It is the responsibility of the Shire of Shark Bay to liaise with Landgate regarding changes to the town boundary. The Department will support Landgate regarding this if requested. | No |
| 46 | Suggests that a buffer of UCL for any future expansion remain between the proposed new town boundary and the proposed South Peron Conservation Park and that the boundary for this extend from the new town boundary, south of the 26th Parallel, to Eagle Bluff Road, across Shark Bay Road in a line that borders Squatter's track, Newbore South Track, Newbore Track, Central West Track, to end at Monkey Mia Road. | | The final boundary of the proposed South Peron (to be named) Conservation Park is still subject to negotiations between the Department, the Shire of Shark Bay and the Department for Planning and Infrastructure. | |
| 47 | Suggests that an MOU between the Shire of Shark Bay and DEC that will address the current and future loss of rate revenue to the Shire of Shark Bay as a result of acquisition of pastoral leases within the planning area by DEC. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. This is subject to further negotiations with the Shire of Shark Bay and the possible establishment of a service agreement. | No |
| 48 | Suggests that the current Zuytdorp Nature Reserve be upgraded to class A. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports statements in the plan. | No |
| 49 | Suggests that the Zuytdorp Nature Reserve be expanded westwards, on the ex-Tamala Station area only, south of latitude 27°S, to the coastline to protect the Zuytdorp Cliffs. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The proposed tenure in the final management plan will be consistent with the Cabinet Decision of September 2007 regarding reserving of former pastoral leases. Map 2 will be changed to show the changes. | Yes |
| 50 | Suggests that the area of ex-Tamala station north of latitude 27°S and the area of Nanga shown on Map 2 as Proposed Zuytdorp Nature Reserve be classified as a Conservation Park, preserving access for mineral exploration and mining, subject to investigation by the EPA. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. See discussion associated with comment number 49 above. | Yes |
| 51 | Suggests that the plan does not provide details about specific mechanisms by which the proposed tenure changes will occur. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. The mechanisms by which the proposed land tenure changes will occur are subject to other legislative requirements under the Land Administration Act. | No |
| 52 | Suggests that the statement, "Reservation of Crown land which has not been subject to prior extinguishment (such as freehold land) will need to comply with the 'future acts' provisions of the Native Title Act. This means that native title rights are protected and conditions are imposed on proposed activities affecting native title. This will apply to pastoral leases and surrendered pastoral lease areas and the creation of conservation reserve in these areas will not extinguish native title" is incorrect. The future acts regime (Part 2, Division 3 of the Native Title Act) does not operate to protect native title rights, but sets out the procedure by which native title rights may be affected, including by extinguishment. Reservation of the land pursuant to the future acts provisions does not automatically mean that native title is not extinguished or affected; it means that the act has been | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The Department believes that native title will not necessarily be extinguished by the reservation of the ex-pastoral leases. However, to add clarity the final sentence of this statement has been changed to, "...the creation of conservation reserve in these areas will not necessarily extinguish native title." and the statement, "The Department's intent is to create the reserves through negotiations with native title claimants to ensure the maintenance of native title rights and interests." | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|----|---|-------|--|-----|
| | <p>validly done. If native title rights and interests of Malgana and Nanda people were to be compulsorily acquired by DEC under s24MD, native title could be extinguished.</p> <p>These could be further impacted by the fact that the extinguishment of native title by reserving land under the CALM Act is not settled. It is not clear that the creation of conservation reserve over Crown land, pastoral leases and surrendered pastoral leases will not extinguish native title and the reservation of conservation estate as proposed in the draft management plan could have the effect of conferring a right of exclusive possession and, as a consequence, may extinguish native title.</p> | | | |
| 53 | <p>Due to the possibility of extinguishing native title as a result of the proposed tenure changes, suggests that the development of an Indigenous Land Use Agreement (ILUA) is the best way to deal with this. This could deal with issues such as joint management and for Traditional Owners to exercise native title rights regarding traditional activities, while ensuring the creation of conservation estate does not extinguish native title.</p> | 1 (e) | <p>Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. See discussion associated with comment number 39 above.</p> | Yes |
| 54 | <p>Does not support the proposed vesting of the 298 hectare Reserve 14918 and suggests that this reserve should be included in the proposed Dirk Hartog Island National Park because: a) this is inconsistent with the Shark Bay Strategic Plan 1997; b) the proposal has been driven by a few individuals, some who are no longer involved with the Shire or able to provide the support such a project requires; c) no business plan has been prepared or approved outlining the on-going management or funding of the project; d) the Denham Interpretive Centre is currently unable to breakeven or operate at a profit and Cape Inscription is very remotes and would be more difficult to manage; e) the Shire of Shark Bay has limited staff and income to focus on an important national heritage project; f) DEC has greater management and control ability to maintain the integrity of the site as part of the national park; g) the integrity of the proposed national park could be compromised with incompatible plans for use of the site; h) the Shire's proposal to build an airstrip adjacent to the lighthouse will conflict with management of the proposed national park; i) none of the values of the site should be compromised and the isolation of the location should not be put at risk; and j) management an uncoordinated authority may lead to conflict and poor support.</p> | 1(e) | <p>Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. DEC continues to work with the Shire of Shark Bay and other State Government agencies regarding the future vesting and management of Reserve 14918.</p> | Yes |
| 55 | <p>Suggests that the geothermal energy prospectivity of the marine and land regions in the proposed tenure changes has not yet been evaluated; data from areas to the north and south indicate possible geothermal energy resources.</p> | 1 (e) | <p>Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Information about geothermal energy potential of the proposed additions added to the plan. However, better placed in Section 16 - <i>Geology, Geomorphology and Soils</i>, with a cross-reference in Section 44 - <i>Mineral and Petroleum Exploration and Development</i>.</p> | Yes |
| 56 | <p>Supports DEC in the acquisition of pastoral leases and other unclassified crown land as it becomes available. In addition to the environmental benefit of managing land for conservation, recreational opportunities and amenity for the public will also be increased.</p> | 2 (a) | <p>Noted. Comment supports statements in the plan.</p> | No |
| 57 | <p>Does not support the proposal to expand the Zuytdorp Nature Reserve from 58 850 hectares to 215 193 hectares because: a) the proposed classification of the expanded area is class A, making it ineligible for mineral exploration and mining and half of the proposed expansion is covered by Gunson's exploration licence applications submitted in 1998. Expansion of the</p> | 1 (e) | <p>Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The proposed tenure in the final management plan will be consistent with the Cabinet Decision of September 2007 regarding reserving of former pastoral leases. Map 2 will be changed to show the changes. Regarding wilderness, it is not necessary to declare wilderness over entire</p> | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------|--|-----|
| | reserve and its classification upgrade would mean that Gunson's would not be able access its exploration targets in the area unless concessions for pre February 2001 exploration licence applications are enacted; b) the longer term vision of converting the expanded Zuytdorp Nature Reserve into a wilderness area would mean that all other activities (including exploration and mining activities) would be prohibited; c) if wilderness is established, there will be pressure to gazette buffer zones around it and Gunson's proposed mining activities (which have Government environmental approval) come within several hundred meters of the expanded Zuytdorp Nature Reserve boundary, which would make any eastern buffer zone to the wilderness area unworkable with Gunson's current mining activity approvals. | | reserves and wilderness can be declared over parts of reserves. The declaration of wilderness over the Zuytdorp Nature Reserve is not proposed during the life of this management plan. If it were to be considered in the review of the management plan, once it has reached the end of its term, the area would be the wilderness quality of the reserve would be reassessed. By this time, if Gunson's proposed mine is operational, it will impact on the area's wilderness quality and the boundary of any proposed wilderness area and its buffer would be established, taking the impact of such a mine into account. | |
| 58 | Acknowledges that the plan proposes incorporating additional areas into the reserve system, not identified in the Shark Bay Regional Strategy (1997). Suggests that the plan contains additional context and justification for including these areas. For example, in the Regional Strategy, South Peron was identified for mixed uses, but the plan suggests that its "botanical importance, landscape features and natural values warrant protection as a class a reserve." Suggests that the detailed explanations of these values provided on pages 55, 124 and 155) be included in this section. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The management plan is mostly consistent with the Shark Bay Regional Strategy. In the Regional Strategy, the proposed tenure for South Peron was identified as a timber reserve, because the potential to harvest sandalwood in the area. The vesting of timber reserves are no longer an option and Conservation Park is the next best option for a multiple use tenure. In addition, the Regional Strategy is now eleven years old and is superceded by this management plan. Additional justification for adding these extra areas into the reserve system has been added to the plan, although this has already been presented in sections 1 Introduction and 11 Tenure. However, in some instances, the level of detail better remains in other parts of the plan. In these instances, further cross references have been included. | Yes |
| 59 | Questions the rationale for proposing Petit Point as a conservation park. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The proposed tenure in the final management plan will be consistent with the Cabinet Decision of September 2007 regarding reserving of former pastoral leases, including the whole of Nanga as a conservation park. Map 2 will be changed to show the changes. | Yes |
| 60 | Questions whether the statement, "However, in the interim it may be necessary for the area to be set aside as an unclassified reserve for the purpose of conservation park while resource issues are addressed between DEC and DOIR." is really the purpose, in relation to the last sentence in the third paragraph under the Part Tamala heading. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The proposed tenure in the final management plan will be consistent with the Cabinet Decision of September 2007 regarding reserving of former pastoral leases. Map 2 will be changed to show the changes. | Yes |
| 61 | Suggests that the term "emu proof fence" (first sentence, fifth paragraph, page 28) is colloquial and the correct term is the State Barrier Fence. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Reference to the State Barrier Fence corrected. | Yes |
| 62 | Suggests the following names for an un-named island or the proposed South Peron (to be named) Conservation Park: Hazlin Island; North Rocks, Lin; Linda; Fossey; Linfoss Islet; Linthrell Island, in memory of Linda North Threlfall who passed away from cancer in April 2008. She sailed through the Shark Bay area in May 2006 and intended to sail around Australia via Shark Bay in May 2008. Her husband still intends to do this trip in September 2008 | 1 (b) | Noted. Comment provides additional information on affected user groups of direct relevance to management. All proposed names will be forwarded to the Nomenclature Committee for assessment. | Yes |
| 63 | Suggests that the plan does not provide details about specific legal acts by which the proposed tenure changes will occur. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. See discussion associated with comment number 51. | No |
| PART C: MANAGING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT | | | | |
| Introduction/General | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |

| 13. Biogeography | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-------|--|-----|
| 64 | Suggests that the first sentence, second paragraph, be changed to " <i>The Directions for the National Reserves System - A Partnership Approach...</i> " | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Sentence corrected. | Yes |
| 65 | Suggests that the first sentence, second paragraph under "Carnarvon Bioregion" be changed to "Within the planning area, the existing reserves, including Francois Peron National Park and the Shell Beach Conservation Park...." | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment based on unclear or factually incorrect information. The standard style is that reference to reserves is not preceded by "the". | No |
| 14. Wilderness | | | | |
| 66 | Questions the application of the wilderness concept to the region due to the decades of goat grazing and vegetation cannot be defined as "slightly modified". | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment based on unclear or factually incorrect information. The determination of wilderness is not subjective, but is well defined. Wilderness quality was determined using the Australian Land Disturbance Database (previously the National Wilderness Inventory), which is maintained by the Commonwealth Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts. Wilderness quality is established using a number of criteria, including: remoteness from settlement; remoteness from access; apparent naturalness; and biophysical naturalness. This database uses a number of datasets to determine these criteria. These include: land cover (natural as opposed to cultural cover); line and features points (roads, tracks, railways, settlements, buildings); environment stratification (rangetype); and land tenure. The model assumes that, in arid zones, biophysical naturalness is related to the intensity of livestock grazing. It also assumes that the intensity of livestock grazing relates to the distribution of permanent and semi permanent water points, the suitability of range type for grazing (grazable, marginal or non-grazable) and tenure (areas that have been pastoral leases in the last 60 years). The presence of feral stock is not considered. In the Shark Bay area, areas of high wilderness quality are in the Zuytdorp area, with very few access tracks and water points. In addition, the Zuytdorp Nature Reserve has been gazetted as a C class reserve for over 30 years and the range type for the proposed nature reserve (which covers ex-Nanga and ex-Tamala Stations) is likely to be marginal or non-grazable. Hence these areas have the highest wilderness quality in the planning area. | No |
| 67 | If wilderness is established, it is anticipated that "buffer zones" could be introduced. Gunson's proposed mining activities, which have Government environmental approval, come within several hundred metres of the expanded Zuytdorp Nature Reserve boundary, rendering an eastern buffer zone to the wilderness area impractical. | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment based on unclear or factually incorrect information. It is not necessary to declare wilderness over entire reserves and wilderness can be declared over parts of reserves. The declaration of wilderness over the Zuytdorp Nature Reserve is not proposed during the life of this management plan. If it were to be considered in the review of this management plan, once it has reached the end of its term, the area would be the wilderness quality of the reserve would be reassessed. By this time, if Gunson's proposed mine is operational, it will impact on the area's wilderness quality and the boundary of any proposed wilderness area and its buffer (which are 500m wide) would be established, taking the impact such a mine into account. Gazetted wilderness areas include the wilderness itself, plus the buffer. | No |
| 15. Climate and Climate Change | | | | |
| 68 | Suggests that Shark Bay will become wetter with climate change, following more cyclone activity and some species may expand their range from the inland towards the coast and colonize the islands. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or were considered during plan preparation. Given that Shark Bay is located in a transition zone between arid and temperate climatic zones, the impacts of climate change on the area are difficult to predict (and this is outlined in the text). It is possible that | No |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------|---|-----|
| | | | Shark Bay may become wetter, but it may also become drier. Either way, the impacts on floral, fauna and ecosystems in the area are likely to be significant. | |
| 16. Geology, Geomorphology and Soils | | | | |
| 69 | Suggests that the first paragraph of this section on page 47 does not accurately describe the Carnarvon Basin. Calling the basin a depression implies a low area and it is formerly known as a basin: an area where the crust at the bottom sank over the period identified, allowing the marine sediments to accumulate to the thickness of 6000m as described. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph about the Carnarvon Basin corrected. | Yes |
| 70 | Refers to the first paragraph and the appearance of peninsulas being due to "anticlinal folds". Suggests that this sentence is incorrect as an anticline is a fold and the appearance of peninsulas is due to the presence of anticlines (peninsulas) and intervening synclines (gulf) not just the anticlines. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph about the peninsulas corrected. | Yes |
| 71 | Refers to the third paragraph that reads "birridas (elliptical salt flats)" and suggests that birridas are not necessarily elliptical and they can be squarish, triangular or complex with indents. Birridas typically have rounded outlines and are flooded, dry or seasonal. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph about the birridas corrected. | Yes |
| 17. Hydrology and Catchment Protection | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 18. Native Plants and Vegetation Associations | | | | |
| 72 | Suggests that the first sentence of the third paragraph under the heading "Flora" be changed to, "In different parts of the planning area, the following numbers of plant species are found have been recorded..." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Statement corrected. | Yes |
| 73 | Suggests that the second sentence under the heading, "Declared Rare Flora" on page 53 be changed to, "Under the EPBC Act <i>E. beardiana</i> is listed as endangered and <i>C. barbarella</i> is listed as vulnerable". | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Statement corrected. | Yes |
| 74 | Suggest that same sentence style is used for the dot points at the bottom of page 53. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Style of dot points updated. | Yes |
| 75 | Questions if the vegetation associations for each area (between pages 54 and 57) are NVIS or Beard's descriptions. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The descriptions have been taken from the National Vegetation Inventory System which is based on Beard, J.S. 1976. <i>Vegetation Survey of Western Australia, Murchison</i> . University of Western Australia Press, Nedlands. This reference has been added to the text. | Yes |
| 76 | Suggests that the ";" be removed from the first sentence of the third paragraph under the heading "Shark Bay Islands" on page 55. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Sentence corrected. | Yes |
| 77 | Suggests that the use of <i>Eucalyptus beardiana</i> in the dot points under the heading Zuytdorp Area, page 56 be more consistent (i.e. use <i>Eucalyptus beardiana</i> in the first instance, then <i>E. beardiana</i> thereafter.) | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Sentence corrected. | Yes |
| 78 | Suggests the correct spelling of <i>Acacia rostellifera</i> in the second set of dot points under the heading Zuytdorp Area on page 56. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Spelling corrected. | Yes |
| 79 | Suggests that the reference to <i>Atriplex</i> sp (bottom of page 56 and top of page 57) be corrected to <i>Atriplex</i> sp. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Sentence corrected.. | Yes |
| 80 | Queries if reference to the Midwest Regional Herbarium in strategy 6 refers to the Herbarium in the DEC Midwest Regional office in Geraldton. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. This reference does refer to the Midwest Regional Herbarium in the Department's Midwest Regional Office in Geraldton. Strategy updated to state, "conducting additional surveys and monitoring especially for rare, priority and poorly known flora, and opportunistically collecting voucher specimens for the Western | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|-------|---|-----|
| | | | Australian Herbarium and the Department's Midwest Regional Herbarium and Shark Bay District's Herbarium." | |
| 19. Native Animals | | | | |
| 81 | Suggests that the paper, "Abbott, I 2008 Historical perspectives of the ecology of some conspicuous vertebrate species in south-west Western Australia. <i>Conservation Science Western Australia</i> 6 (3): 1-214." is referred to in this section. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details not necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long term. This article relevant to south west fauna, not fauna in Shark Bay. | No |
| 82 | Suggests that the success rates of the introduction of 'iconic' fauna, especially mammals is described as this has the potential to influence future management decisions during the process of 'reconstructing fauna'. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes a general statement and no change is sought | No |
| 83 | Suggests the need for further surveys on native land snail species as a) they are deserving of conservation for their own sake, b) they are important components of food webs and c) they can indicate areas of unusual habitats shared by other less obvious invertebrate taxa. Species living on sand tend to be widespread, whereas rock dwellers have a more limited distribution. Information about land snails in Shark Bay is sketchy and largely gained opportunistically. There is virtually no knowledge of their biology or ecological requirements. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. The recommendation of further research into specific invertebrates such as land snails in particular is too detailed for the management plan. The list of further research requirements, outlined in Section 56 - <i>Research and Monitoring</i> proposes the need for more "invertebrate fauna surveys", which would include species such as land snails. This requested change is covered by strategy 3. | No |
| 84 | Suggests that there is a plan to integrate the pure dingo as a top order predator into the planning area in the near future which would assist in the maintenance of healthy populations, reduce the risk of impacts by mesopredators suppressed by the dingo and reduce the use of 1080 baiting, thus reducing management costs. Advises that this recommendation would not be applicable in all areas as dingoes and people do not mix, but could be planned for more remote areas. Keystone species, especially the dingo must be allowed to persist. | 2 (f) | Noted. Comment contributes options that are not feasible. Dingoes already exist in the planning area. Introducing more dingoes may increase predation on the threatened fauna species being reintroduced to Shark Bay and would be a risk to the ecological restoration of the area. In addition, given that much of the existing and proposed tenure to the south and east is surrounded by pastoral properties, the introduction of dingoes to the planning area would likely to be highly controversial. Furthermore, only very small parts of the planning area are baited. Given that the dingo is not a threatened or priority species listed under the Wildlife Conservation Act, it is well down on the list of priorities fauna species to reintroduce to the planning area. | No |
| 85 | Does not support the proposal to provide 2km grid monitoring tracks for ATV vehicles because a) other less invasive alternatives based on solar energy are available and should be promoted as a commitment for future access; b) much of the area is densely vegetated; c) the area is too fragile to support monitoring tracks and some areas could support wilderness; d) the reopening of limited existing pastoral tracks for vehicle access and walking trails would be more consistent with the vision for the management of the national park; and e) the establishment of fewer tracks could achieve a similar result. Suggests that alternatives to ATVs such as solar buggies and reopening existing tracks and walk trails would be a better option. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. There are no viable or efficient solar-powered vehicles and any vehicle, regardless of how it is powered, requires a track to travel on. ATVs were considered to be the most appropriate as they are able to travel over rough terrain, are narrower than normal passenger vehicles and would require only very minimal track construction. Advice received is that using existing pastoral tracks and reinstating old tracks will not achieve adequate cat control. However, text changed to state that this is only an option and that, "Removal of introduced predators and herbivores may require the construction of monitoring tracks...." (see also page 58 of final plan) | Yes |
| 86 | Suggests that the fifth sentence of the second paragraph under the heading "Dirk Hartog Island Ecological Restoration" be changed to, "These transects will be used to monitor the presence of cats presence after the initial baiting." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Sentence corrected. | Yes |
| 87 | Suggests that last paragraph under the heading, "Dirk Hartog Island Ecological Restoration" be changed to "The project will also involve the control of introduced plants...establishment of an informative education program, establishment of an operations centre..." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Sentence corrected. | Yes |
| 88 | Suggests that the last sentence of the third paragraph on page 61 be changed to, "...and the CSIRO will provide support to translocated animals to Peron | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Sentence corrected. | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------|--|-----|
| | Peninsula, Faure Island or other appropriate sites." | | | |
| 89 | Suggests that the third paragraph under the heading, "Threatened and Other Specially Protected Fauna" should refer to Appendix 4 instead of Appendix 3. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Sentence corrected. | Yes |
| 90 | Suggests that the correct name for the elapid snakes are <i>Neelaps bimaculata</i> , instead of <i>Vermicella bimaculata</i> and <i>Brachyurophis fasciolata</i> instead of <i>V. fasciolata</i> . | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Names corrected. | Yes |
| 91 | Suggests that the numbering in the last sentence of the third paragraph on page 65 is consistent. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Numbering corrected. | Yes |
| 20. Ecological Communities | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 21. Environmental Weeds | | | | |
| 92 | Suggests that the last two sentences of the first paragraph are changed to the following: "Environmental weeds displace native plants, particularly on disturbed sites, by competing with them for light, nutrients, water and space. They also change nutrient conditions, hydrological patterns, soil erosion patterns, light distribution, geomorphological processes, biomass distribution and substantially reduce regeneration of native plants. Environmental weeds can also have a significant adverse impact on other natural values by altering animal habitats, harbouring pests and diseases and increasing fire hazard." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. First paragraph updated to reflect this information. | Yes |
| 93 | Advises that, with the establishment of the new Biosecurity Council under the Biosecurity and Agriculture Management Act 2007 (BAM Act), the future of the WA Weeds Committee is uncertain. Suggests retaining the reference to the WA Weeds Committee, but adding the comment that, given the implementation of the new BAM Act, this group is under review. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. First paragraph updated to reflect this information. | Yes |
| 94 | Suggests that the second paragraph, page 70 be changed to: "Options for environmental weed management include prevention, eradication, control, containment, asset protection, monitoring or <u>limited action</u> ." Even when nothing is being done to actively control an infestation, monitoring or the control of outlying populations is still likely to occur. Consequently the option of "doing nothing" is rare. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph updated to reflect this information. | Yes |
| 95 | Suggests the addition of a new paragraph about DEC's new process to prioritise weed species and Regional Weed Management Plans, such as "The Department commenced a weed risk management project in 2008 that will prioritise each of the 26 bioregions defined by the Interim Biogeographic Rationalisation of Australia (IBRA). This project will involve the prioritisation of weed species through the assessment of their invasiveness, impacts, potential and current distribution and feasibility of control. It will also investigate the use of an asset protection based approach for the prioritisation of established weeds. This looks at the prioritisation of management actions aimed at protection of environmental assets from the threat posed by established weeds. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Additional information added (see also page 67 of final plan). | Yes |
| 96 | Suggests that the first sentence of paragraph four, page 70 should refer to Appendix 5, not Appendix 4. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph corrected. | Yes |
| 97 | Suggests that the fourth sentence of paragraph 4, page 70 should be changed to, "Weed numbers are low compared with other areas of Western | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph corrected. | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|--|-----|
| | Australia (Keighery and Longman 2004). This is probably due to the original vegetation still being largely intact (Keighery <i>et al.</i> 2000) and because of the harsher climate compared to the south-west." | | | |
| 98 | Suggests that paragraph 5, page 70 be changed to, "Weed species have had significant impacts on different parts of the planning area. Buffel grass (<i>Cenchrus ciliaris</i>) is widespread over Peron Peninsula and parts of Dirk Hartog Island. Buffel grass, a tough perennial tussock grass, was actively spread by the pastoral industry. Buffel grass displaces native species and can rapidly establish a monoculture. It favours lighter sandy soils, particularly along water courses. Buffel grass spreads through the dispersal of its fluffy burrs (seeds) by wind, water and animals, particularly along drainage lines and roads. Its spread along roads can also be assisted by vehicle draughts and movement of soils by graders and other vehicles (CRC for Australian Weed Management, Weed Management Guide Buffel Grass - <i>Cenchrus ciliaris</i> , 2008). It is also known to reproduce vegetatively, via rhizomes and stolon sprouts (this has only been found to be reported in one document - Tu M. 2002 Element Stewardship Abstract for <i>Cenchrus ciliaris</i> L. The Nature Conservancy's Wildland Invasive Species Team, Department of Vegetable Crops and Weed Sciences, University of California.) Control of buffel grass is difficult, with no single control method being effective, particularly in light of the landscape scale of control required in the planning area. Hence the eradication of buffel grass within the planning area is likely to be impossible. The key to management of this species is the prevention of new infestations or control of small infestations where management can be effective. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph updated to reflect this information. | Yes |
| 99 | Suggests that the reference to tamarisk in paragraph one, page 71 be deleted. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph corrected. | Yes |
| 100 | Suggests that the last sentence of paragraph one, page 71 should refer to Appendix 5, not Appendix 4. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph corrected. | Yes |
| 101 | Suggests the addition of the text, "These Acts are being replaced by the Biosecurity and Agriculture Management Act (BAM) Act 2007. Provisions of the BAM Act 2007 will be progressively implemented from 1st July 2009." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Information added to paragraph. | Yes |
| 102 | Suggests that the last sentence of paragraph two, page 71 should refer to Appendix 5, not Appendix 4. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph corrected. | Yes |
| 103 | Suggests an additional dot point be added to paragraph 3, page 71, "The invasiveness and impacts of these weed species." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Information added to paragraph. | Yes |
| 104 | Suggests that the second sentence of the final paragraph on page 71 (before the dot points) be changed to, "Preparation of a prioritised weed management plan for the planning area is required, which is based on" | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph partially corrected. | Yes |
| 105 | Suggests that strategy 3 be changed to, "preparing a weed management plan and subsequent management program on a priority basis according to the criteria listed above." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Strategy changed. | Yes |
| 106 | Suggests that the reference to the Department's Policy Statement (draft) <i>Environmental Weed Management</i> on page 69 and in strategy 5 is retained, but add that this is subject to final revision. Remove the reference to the <i>Department's Policy Statement No. 14 - Weeds on CALM Lands</i> . | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph and strategy partially corrected. | Yes |
| 107 | Suggests the addition of the BAM Act to strategy 10. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Strategy changed. | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------|---|-----|
| 108 | Suggests that the key performance indicator does not refer to the weeds rated as high under the Environmental Weed Strategy given that this will be replaced by the new prioritised list in the next couple of years. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Key performance indicator changed to, "The number and area of weed species at priority sites with a high rating according to the Environmental Weed Strategy or equivalent prioritisation process". | Yes |
| 109 | Suggests that the reference to <i>Passiflora foetida</i> var <i>hispidia</i> in the last sentence above the box on page 71 does not need to be in brackets. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Sentence corrected. | Yes |
| 110 | In the third key point, questions whether statement should be that the introduction of weeds has been a bi-product of "adjoining" land practices or "previous" land practices. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. "Previous" land practices is more correct and key point has been changed. | Yes |
| 22. Introduced and Other Problem Animals | | | | |
| 111 | Suggests that the paper, "Abbott, I 2008 Historical perspectives of the ecology of some conspicuous vertebrate species in south-west Western Australia. <i>Conservation Science Western Australia</i> 6 (3): 1-214." is referred to in this section. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details not necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long term. This article relevant to south west fauna, not fauna in Shark Bay. | No |
| 112 | Suggests the need for more research on introduced slug and snail species, which can be transported from areas north and south of Shark Bay buried in pot plants, on vehicles and in loads of timber and can survive and multiply in humid household conditions. They compete with native snails for food and habitat and prey on the eggs and young of native snail populations. Knowledge about the nature, distribution and effects of introduced slugs and snails is very limited. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details not necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long term. Encouraging further research on introduced slugs and snails in particular is too detailed for the management plan and is covered in the more general strategy, " supporting research into the impacts of introduced predators and herbivores in the planning area". | No |
| 113 | Does not support the proposal to encourage community groups and sporting clubs to assist in goat eradication on Dirk Hartog Island because: a) involvement of non-dedicated vermin control groups has led to problems in the management and control of these groups and their expectation for a holiday, limiting the effectiveness of the end result; and b) the isolation of Dirk Hartog Island and distance from safety and medical assistance means that use of these groups can be dangerous. Suggest that only dedicated shooters contracted specifically to eradicate goats are the most effective way of obtaining results | 2 (e) | Noted. Comment is one of several divergent viewpoints and the plan contains the best option. This is a decision for the Department. All feral animal control programs in the planning area are carried out according to Departmental policy and guidelines (as per strategy 3 in this section). All people involved in control programs (whether DEC staff, contractors or community groups) conform with these policies and guidelines to ensure the safety of those involved and visitors to the planning and the effectiveness of the program. In some instances the use of contract shooters will be the most appropriate, in other instances community groups will be. | No |
| 114 | Suggests that rats are not present on Dirk Hartog Island | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity and statement about rats on Dirk Hartog Island deleted. | Yes |
| 115 | Suggest that the statement, "Hunters must have: a licence to carry firearms on lands managed by the Department under the CALM Act and Firearms Act 1973; and written authorisation allowing the licensee to hunt feral animals on lands managed by the Department." indicates a desire to licence a lot of people for hunting. | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment was based on unclear or factually incorrect information. This statement does not indicate the desire to licence a lot of people for hunting, rather it outlines the licensing requirements for people to hunt feral animals in the planning area. | No |
| 116 | Suggests that the statement "complete reconstruction of pre-European native fauna may be possible" on Dirk Hartog Island (fifth paragraph under the heading, "Red Foxes and Feral Cats" is not correct as it will not be possible to reintroduce native species that are completely extinct in Australia. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Statement changed to, "If cats can be removed, the reconstruction of the extant pre-European native fauna may be possible." | Yes |
| 117 | Questions the presence of feral pigs in the Zuytdorp Nature Reserve. | 1 (e) | Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. The presence of feral pigs in the Zuytdorp Nature Reserve was anecdotal and this reference has been removed. | Yes |
| 23. Diseases | | | | |
| 118 | Suggests that the paper, "Abbott, I 2008 Historical perspectives of the | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details not necessary for inclusion in a document | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------|--|-----|
| | ecology of some conspicuous vertebrate species in south-west Western Australia. <i>Conservation Science Western Australia</i> 6 (3): 1-214." is referred to in this section. | | aimed at providing management direction over the long term. | |
| 119 | Questions the use of italics for " <i>Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis</i> " | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment was based on unclear or factually incorrect information. The use of italics for this term is correct (Weldon et al. 2004) | No |
| 24. Fire | | | | |
| 120 | Suggests that the wording in sentences two and three of the second paragraph of Section 24 -Fire is awkward and should be rewritten. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph reworded. | Yes |
| 121 | Suggests that the first paragraph on page 83 is repetitive and does not address the frequency of ignitions. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph reworded although 'known' fires does reflect frequency. | Yes |
| 122 | Suggests the reference to Burrows et al. 1991 in the third paragraph on page 86 relates to studies completed in the Gibson Desert and is not applicable to Shark Bay. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Statement added that this study was carried out in the Gibson Desert, but given the presence of spinifex in the planning area, it is applicable to Shark Bay. | Yes |
| 123 | Suggests that paragraph 4 on page 86 be reworded to reduce the number of commas it contains. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph reworded. | Yes |
| 124 | Suggests that the first sentence of the first paragraph under the heading "Fire Research" is contradictory as it states that the planning area is fire prone when in previous paragraphs, there are statement that the planning area is not fire prone. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Paragraph reworded to remove the reference to the planning area being fire -prone. | Yes |
| 125 | Suggests that the second dot point in the second paragraph under the heading "Fire Research" be changed to "documenting the fire response and vital attributes of" | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Dot point corrected. | Yes |
| 126 | Questions why "identifying community assets and developing strategies to protect them" is the top priority of listed fire management strategies for the planning area on page 89. | 2 (e) | Noted. Comment is one of several divergent viewpoints and the plan contains the best option. One of the key objectives for the Department as listed in DEC's Fire Management Policy, is providing protection for human life and community assets. Therefore it is near the top of the list. Also the order of the list itself does not necessarily reflect its priority. | No |
| 127 | Suggests that the first dot point half way down page 91 is confusing, especially the statement, "b) present low risk escapes from planned burns are minimised;" and suggests rewording. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Dot point reworded. | Yes |
| PART D: MANAGING OUR CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | |
| General Comments | | | | |
| 128 | Suggests that all references to the 'WA Maritime Museum' in this chapter should be changed to the 'WA Museum' | 1 (e) | Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. | Yes |
| 25. Heritage Legislation and Policy Framework | | | | |
| 129 | Advises that there are no Heritage Agreements in the planning area and no Conservation Orders has been issued. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details not necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long term. | No |
| 130 | Advises of 48 places in or in close proximity to the planning area listed on the Register of Heritage Places. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Most of these places listed are located outside the planning area, in Denham township. | No |
| 131 | Advises of the definition of 11 types of heritage listing: Register of Heritage Places; Heritage Council of WA Assessment Program; National Heritage List; Jetties/riverbed/seabed; Classified by the National Trust; Municipal Inventory; Register of Heritage Estate; Indigenous Heritage Sites; State Government Inventory; Statewide War Memorial Survey and Natural/Aboriginal Sites. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details that are not appropriate or necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long term. These definitions are too detailed for the management plan. | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-------|--|-----|
| 132 | Suggests that the Shire of Shark Bay, Shire of Carnarvon and Shire of Northampton should be contacted regarding recent additions to their Municipal Inventory in the planning area, a list of places considered to have heritage value by the local community and can be protected by inclusion in Town Planning Schemes. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details that are not appropriate or necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long term. No new sites within the 'planning area'. | No |
| 133 | Suggests that all references to the 'WA Maritime Museum' should be changed to the 'WA Museum' | 1 (e) | Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. | Yes |
| 26. Indigenous Heritage | | | | |
| 134 | Suggests that the reference to smoke on Dirk Hartog Island is ambiguous, as he states explicitly that no traces of human activity was seen. The smoke could have been the result of a lightning strike. Caudwell, K 1934 Western Australian Historical Society 2 (16): 6-8 gives a more comprehensive translation than Marchant. | 2 (e) | Noted. Comment is one of several divergent viewpoints and the strategies of the plan are still considered the best option. The management plan does not suggest that the siting of smoke indicates the presence of Aboriginal people on Dirk Hartog Island and states that no other explorers saw or recorded evidence of Aboriginal people on the island. Rather, it states that St Alouarn simply saw smoke and that the crew found what they believed was evidence of fires and cleared areas. Consequently, the plan has not been changed. | No |
| 135 | Suggests that some of the language used in the draft management plan to describe the relationship of Traditional Owners to country is inaccurate and possible offensive. In a number of places, the plan uses the past tense when describing the connection of Nanda and Malgana people to their country and culture. For example, "Through the protection of significant sites Malgana and Nanda can <i>rediscover</i> and maintain their heritage, identity and culture, and attachment to the land." and "There has been interest by Malgana and Nanda to be involved in the management of conservation estate and <i>re-establish</i> cultural ties to the land." (emphasis added). This implies that Malgana people have lost their heritage, identity, and cultural ties to the land and DEC is not qualified to make this assessment. Suggests these statements are rewritten or removed. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. This section rewritten to refer to the relationship of Traditional Owners in the present tense. | Yes |
| 136 | Acknowledges that the management plan proposes changes to roads and access tracks and suggests that these be the subject of consultation with the Nanda and Malgana claim group to ensure that cultural heritage is protected. Suggest that heritage surveys be required to ensure that Aboriginal sites are protected in the process of changing existing roads/tracks or creating new ones. The Nanda and Malgana claim groups should also be consulted about the closure of roads and tracks as this may affect the ability of Traditional Owners to access significant sites. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. The protection of Indigenous cultural heritage from potential impacts and consulting with claim groups is covered in strategies outlined in this section, these being: "protecting and maintaining Indigenous cultural heritage by complying with the relevant State and Commonwealth legislation and Department policy; managing and regularly monitoring threatening process...and visitor activities to ensure Indigenous cultural heritage is not adversely affected; liaising with and involving local Aboriginal people and relevant organisations, government agencies, organisations and community groups, to improve the protection, conservation and, where necessary, restoration of Indigenous cultural heritage including establishment of cultural heritage management reference groups; and consulting with Malgana and Nanda on management plans and proposed public works to identify cultural heritage and cultural resources." | No |
| 137 | Acknowledges that ethnographic and archaeological surveys of the planning area will be conducted to identify, protect and manage sites in conjunction with local Aboriginal people. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 138 | Suggests that most heritage surveys in the planning area have been conducted for specific research projects and that the only systematic examination of the region is, "Fry, R., Jackson, G., and Smith, J. 1995 The Report of an Aboriginal Heritage Study of the Shark Bay Region Study | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. DEC recognises the importance of carrying out heritage inspections prior to particular developments or areas with visitor access and this is covered in the strategy, "managing and regularly monitoring threatening | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|--|-----|
| | Area, Western Australia. Prepared for the Department of Planning and Development", which was a desktop survey and incorporated ground surveys at Denham and Monkey Mia. Suggests that there are sites in the area not on the DIA Register of Aboriginal Sites and that areas of specific projects or areas with visitor access be subject to heritage inspections. | | processes (such as fire, introduced plants and animals) and visitor activities to ensure Indigenous cultural heritage is not adversely impacted. | |
| 139 | Suggests that typically heritage sites have been identified in coastal dunes. In addition many Aboriginal people were involved in industries such as pearling, pastoralism and fishing and some of the heritage sites associated with these industries may have site components or evidence of this involvement and may constitute sites under the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i> . | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Information added to the text of the plan. | Yes |
| 140 | Suggests that management options for heritage sites might involve diverting access paths and vehicle tracks away from sites, relocating accommodation and infrastructure to avoid sites and include appropriate materials in interpretive displays. The use of fences can constitute concealment so the landowner is required to have a permit under Section 16 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 to avoid an offence under Section 17 of this Act. If any projects are in conflict with heritage sites, the landowner is required to submit a notice under Section 16 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act to obtain prior consent of Minister of Indigenous Affairs to use the land. DIA cannot provide this consent. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. This information is too detailed for the management plan. The specific location of paths, access tracks, accommodation and other infrastructure and their impacts on Aboriginal heritage sites would be the subject of the site development planning which occurs prior to the development of individual sites. DEC recognises the importance of carrying out heritage inspections prior to particular developments or areas with visitor access and this is covered in the strategy, "managing and regularly monitoring threatening processes (such as fire, introduced plants and animals) and visitor activities to ensure Indigenous cultural heritage is not adversely impacted. In addition, the strategy, "protecting and maintaining Indigenous cultural heritage by complying with the relevant State and Commonwealth legislation and Department policy" will ensure that protection of heritage sites occurs in accordance with the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i> | No |
| 141 | Suggests that a cultural management plan be developed and implemented with the involvement of local Aboriginal people and to include a strategy for the protection of sites and for the monitoring of visitor impacts on these sites. DIA can provide assistance with the development of this plan and it should be reviewed annually. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details that are not appropriate or necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long term. The Department supports the development of a cultural management plan by the Department of Indigenous Affairs, in conjunction with native title claimant groups. The Department will meet its requirements under the Aboriginal Heritage Act by ensuring that ethnographic and archaeological surveys are carried out prior to the development of sites. | No |
| 27. Non-Indigenous Heritage | | | | |
| 142 | Suggests that the statement, "Most of Shark Bay's geographic features were named by or in honour of European explorers" be moved to the introduction of this section. | 1 (e) | Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. | Yes |
| 143 | Suggests that the sentence, "A general requirement for the protection of heritage sites is that visitors should not be allowed to use metal detectors." be reworded to, "A general requirement for the protection of heritage sites is that visitors should not be allowed to use or have in their possession metal detectors without a permit. Fossicking by enthusiasts and souvenir hunters for historical relics disturbs archaeological sites and contexts, and removed valuable archaeological information from sites." | 1 (e) | Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Information on metal detectors added. | Yes |
| 144 | Suggests that the statement, " The WAMM has a 7.3 hectare reserve on the coast for the purpose of 'Protection of the Zuytdorp wreck' to "The WA Museum has a 7.3 hectare reserve known as the Zuytdorp Cliffs Reserve. The <i>Zuytdorp Cliffs Reserve Bylaws 1971</i> prohibit lighting fires, digging or the removal of any objects from the Reserve, and the carrying of diving equipment and firearms in the Reserve. The WA Museum is aware of | 1 (e) | Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|-----|
| | reports of European material related to the Zuytdorp survivors existing outside the Zuytdorp Cliffs Reserve and therefore management of the Zuytdorp Nature Reserve should consider the possibility of archaeological material in any management decisions relating to this area." | | | |
| 145 | Suggests that the statement, "a stone wall served as a jetty" be changed to "a stone jetty". | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. | Yes |
| 146 | Suggests that Dampier's substantial botanical collection was from Dirk Hartog Island, not Bernier Island and that this should be corrected. | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment based on unclear or factually incorrect information. Impacts for this pastoralist are likely to be minimal. The reference Spencer 1981 was used to write the sections relating to William Dampier's exploration in Shark Bay. According to Spencer (1981) Dampier collected botanical samples from Bernier Island and made observations of plants and animals on Dirk Hartog Island and this is reflected in the plan. Given that the submitter did not provide any evidence or reference supporting the statement that Dampier collected more material from Dirk Hartog Island, this comment has not been included. | No |
| PART E: MANAGING VISITOR USE | | | | |
| Introduction/General | | | | |
| 147 | Suggests that the plan identifies and addresses coastal physical processes setback requirements. Advises that all proposed development need to take into consideration Schedule 1 of State Planning Policy No. 2.6 State Coastal Planning Policy (Coastal Development Setback Guidelines for Physical Processes) and suggests that the plan identifies the proposed actions and how they need to comply with this policy. Developments would need to be assessed on a case by case basis. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Information relating to these policies added to the plan where relevant. | Yes |
| 148 | Suggests that developments would also need to be assessed according to Section F of the State Planning Policy No. 2.6 State Coastal Planning Policy (Development in Cyclone Prone Areas), which is applicable north of latitude 30°. Developments in these areas need to be set back to avoid storm surge and being inundated by Category 5 cyclones and are assessed on a case by case basis. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Information relating to these policies added to the plan where relevant. | Yes |
| 149 | Supports a user pays system provided funds are utilized in the planning area and not siphoned off into consolidated revenue. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. Visitor and camping fees are applicable in the planning area. Day passes and camping fees are go into funding to manage the planning area. However with revenue raised from the sale of four week and annual passes (which are sold throughout the State, not only within the planning area), a proportion goes to the regions and a proportion goes to the Parks and Visitor Services Division. This is set at Statewide level and is beyond the scope of the management plan. | No |
| 28. Recreation Use Planning | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 29. Recreation and Tourism Opportunities | | | | |
| 150 | Suggests that text under the heading Regional Recreation Context be updated to ensure the inclusion of initiatives undertaken by Tourism WA over the past 2 years. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. | Yes |
| 151 | Suggests that paragraph 3, page 116 be replaced with the following text: "Tourism WA's Strategic Plan 2008-2013: Building for the Future (2008) identifies the need to develop, promote and protect the State's iconic tourism experiences. This will provide the platform for increased | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text updated to include this new information about Tourism WA's strategic plan. However, three paragraphs is too detailed and this information was summarised. | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|--|-----|
| | competitiveness, viability and profitability for the WA tourism industry. There is now more focus on increasing yield from tourism, rather than simply growing the numbers and there is an increasing recognition of the need to consistently address and meet triple bottom line sustainability objectives. " | | | |
| 152 | "Tourism WA has established Destination Development Strategies for each of the five tourism regions within the State. The objective is to focus regional development resources on enhancing tourism product in iconic experience areas. The <i>Australia's Coral Coast Destination Development Strategy, an action approach</i> (Tourism WA 2007) recognises the importance of the Shark Bay area and see the World Heritage Property as a premium tourism destination that can be marketed nationally and internationally. Research conducted for the Coral Coast as part of producing this strategy identified the following most well known experiences: Marine eco/nature based tourism; relaxing water-based holidays; active water based holidays; fishing safaris; and wildflower discoveries." "Australia's Coral Coast is seen as having the potential to appeal to all markets and attracts significant international interest. The Shark Bay area has strong iconic significance but there is a requirement for improvement to market readiness. Some of the key gaps that need to be addressed include a lack of transport to the area, a lack of top range accommodation and a lack of non-aquatic activities." | | | |
| 153 | Suggests that paragraph 7, page 116 be replaced with the following text: "The Tourism WA three year average (2005-2007) visitor survey results for Shark Bay showed that 49% were from intrastate, 17% from interstate, with 34% international. Holiday or leisure was by far the most common purpose to visit the area. Seventy-seven percent of domestic visitors recorded holiday/leisure as their purpose for visiting the area whilst 99% of international visitors suggested that holiday/pleasure was their reason for coming. Caravan or camping was accommodation for 41% of domestic and 36% of international visitors. Most (74%) of all visitors used a private car or company vehicle to get there (Tourism WA 2008)" Suggested this paragraph would be better placed in the section on recreation and tourism opportunities. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text updated to include this new information about but retained under the heading of "Visitor Numbers and Trends/Patterns of Use". | Yes |
| 154 | Suggests that the gaps in tourism product and lack of top-end accommodation (see comment number 152) reflects a Statewide trend in many regional and remote areas and Tourism WA is addressing this through the Landbank project, which is referred to in a number of places in the plan. Concerned that where Landbank is referred to in the plan, it is presented as a concession or in an apologetic manner and that the plan suggests that the remote and natural experiences of Shark Bay should be retained and that tourist developments should remain within existing nodes outside of DEC estate. Tourism WA acknowledges the need for the conservative management of remote and natural environments and the benefits of developing tourism nodes outside the conservation estate. However, suggests that a more positive and proactive approach should be taken to realise the potential of the area and that the virtues of low impact accommodation without compromising the values of the planning area | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. The development of commercial opportunities and the benefits they bring to the planning area are discussed in Section 33 - <i>Tourism and Commercial Operations</i> . | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------|---|----|
| | should be presented in the plan. Suggests that a low impact accommodation project that meets triple bottom line sustainability objectives can be an asset and provide high quality experiences not possible outside of DEC estate and provide DEC with opportunities to direct the accommodation project and the experiences associated with it. | | | |
| 155 | Acknowledges the consistent approach to visitor management settings and varied recreation opportunities allowing for sustainable recommendations for "highly modified" to "wilderness" areas. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 30. Visitor Access | | | | |
| 156 | Advises there are no Airservices Australia properties or facilities in the planning area and no impacts on Air Services Australia operations are expected. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes a general statement and no change is sought. | No |
| 157 | Advises that any future activities that may impact on aeronautical facilities will require assessment by Airservices Australia so that actions to mitigate these can be implemented before the activity commences. Activities can be subject to investigation by Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) or Airservices Australia under the <i>Civil Aviation Act 1998</i> and may require some modification to eliminate interference. The assessment of environmental and operational policies and laws are the responsibility of land-use planning agencies within each State or Territory. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details that are not appropriate or necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long-term. | No |
| 158 | Supports the management of 4WD tracks throughout the planning area by DEC. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 159 | Suggests that Malgana and Nanda people be exempt from roads closed to the public to ensure that Malgana and Nanda people continue to have access to their significant sites. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details that are not appropriate or necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long-term. Roads and tracks may be closed for a range of reasons including to ensure the safety of all visitors, including Aboriginal people. The Department recognises the importance of accessing significant sites by Malgana and Nanda people and will work with these working groups and local people to ensure access to these areas. | No |
| 160 | Suggest that DEC considers working with the Malgana and Nanda claim groups and Yamatji Land and Sea Council to develop information for visitors to the planning area about how taking vehicles off-road can negatively impact on Indigenous heritage and sites of significance. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. This is covered by a number of strategies including in section 26 - Indigenous Heritage, "presenting information about Indigenous cultural heritage to visitors through appropriate and relevant information, interpretation and education." and in Section 53 - Information, Interpretation and Education, "providing information to visitors on the World Heritage, natural and cultural values and appropriate activities and behaviour." and "ensuring traditional custodians have a primary and active role in communication planning pertinent to Indigenous cultural heritage." Details about specific information to be presented to visitors about Indigenous cultural heritage is too detailed for the management plan and will be established in consultation with the Malgana and Nanda Native Title working groups. | No |
| 161 | Supports rationalising and managing visitor access tracks, as long as reasonable access to areas used by recreational fishermen for many years is maintained. Suggests that walk in access is not suitable for recreational fishing as vehicle access is required to carry communication, safety and fishing equipment, shade food and water. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. The plan provides for vehicle access to a range of suitable fishing locations across the planning area. | No |
| 162 | Applauds plans to increase accessibility across the Shark Bay Region for those in 4WDs seeking a remote experience. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |

| 31. Visual Landscape | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|---|-----|
| 163 | Suggests that the plan refers to the <i>Visual Landscape Planning in Western Australia: a manual for evaluation, assessment, siting and design</i> , produced by the Western Australian Planning Commission/Department for Planning, which provides methods for identifying and assessing visual landscapes and siting and design guidelines for land uses and landscape. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. | Yes |
| 32. Recreation Activities and Use | | | | |
| 164 | Concerned that the plan allows for a large amount of infrastructure to be added to park facilities, which will lead to an increased volume of traffic through Hamlin Station and that activities outlined in the document will impact on pastoral operations. Suggests that a program be built into the management plan to ensure that the pastoral lessee is able to carry out his business with minimal interruption from the development of infrastructure and increased visitor numbers. | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment based on unclear or factually incorrect information. Impacts for this pastoralist are likely to be minimal. The plan proposes that ex-Nanga Station (which is the only part of the planning area which adjoins Hamelin Station) become Nanga Conservation Park. Improvements to existing recreation sites and new visitor developments are proposed for reserves well away from Hamelin Station (for example, the proposed Edel Land National Park, the proposed South Peron Conservation Park, the proposed Dirk Hartog Island National Park and the Francois Peron National Park). In addition, no changes to access to or within Hamelin Station are proposed and the only access through Hamelin Station will continue to be via the Shark Bay Road (managed by Main Roads Western Australia) and the Hamelin Pool Caravan Park access road. Consequently, over the life of the plan, it is not expected that there will be an increase in visitor numbers on these roads through Hamelin Station and impacts on the operation of the pastoral lease are likely to be minimal. | No |
| 32.1 - Recreational Activities and Use - Wildlife Encounters | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 32.2 - Recreational Activities and Use - Scenic and Recreational Driving | | | | |
| 165 | Supports the use of brochures/park passes to provide details of attractions, directions (including trip notes) and code of conduct (general and for specific areas) to minimise signage that could be subject to vandalism. | 2 (c) and (d) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or were considered during the plan preparation and is beyond the scope of the plan. The range of interpretive material (including brochures) proposed of the planning area is outlined in Section 53 - Information, Interpretation and Education. However, specific information to be included in publications is too detailed for the management plan. The visitor management settings will guide the appropriate level of development for recreation sites. A range of criteria, including the number of sites and the likely interaction with other visitors are part of the visitor management settings for the area and these are outlined in Appendix 7 of the plan. | No |
| 32.3 - Recreational Activities and Use - Overnight Stays | | | | |
| 166 | Suggests that the sections on camping do not provide details of: the proposed number of campsites; the size of campsites and associated numbers of people, tents, vehicles, trailers; the separation of sites for generator use, noise, disturbance and security; the proximity of sites to fishing spots; time or occupancy limits; facilities provided specifically for fishermen and other details. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. For an area as large as Shark Bay, it is not possible to provide this level of detail in a management plan and, in most cases, this detail has not yet been established. More detailed planning, which provides this type of information, occurs as part of the site development planning process which occurs when individual sites are developed and this issue will be considered during this process. Public consultation is also associated with this next phase of planning. | No |
| 167 | Acknowledges that camping in remote natural settings has been provided for. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------|--|-----|
| 168 | Advises that developments would need to be assessment to ensure they comply with Schedule 1 of State Planning Policy No. 2.6 State Coastal Planning Policy (Coastal Development Setback Guidelines for Physical Processes). | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Information relating to this policy added to the plan where relevant. | Yes |
| 169 | In reference to strategy 4, suggests that 4WD accessible camping sites are developed to be suitable for vehicle based camping, with a footprint for a vehicle, annex, tent and seating area. 4WDs today are well equipped with storage and electrical items that they are now an integral part of a campsite. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. This level of planning is too detailed for a management plan and, in most cases, this detail has not yet been established. More detailed planning, which provides this type of information, occurs as part of the site development planning process which occurs when individual sites are developed and this issue will be considered during this process. Given that most DEC campsites are vehicle-accessible, facilities provided at these are focussed on vehicle-based camping. | No |
| 170 | In reference to strategy 6, suggests that fires be permitted as they are central to most campsites, especially on cold nights or for cooking. Suggests that fees charged could include access to imported firewood for use in concrete fire pits. The number of fire pits could be according to the size of the campsite or be a centrally located fire pit. | 2 (e) | Noted. Comment is one of several divergent viewpoints and the plan contains the best option. The impacts of open fires on the planning area are clearly outlined in this section of the plan. Fires for cultural, educational or interpretive reasons will continue to be permitted. | No |
| 171 | Supports the ethos visitors taking rubbish with them and not providing bins at remote campsites. Collection could be at the entrance to an area and accessible for removal by truck. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. Strategy 3 in Section 32.4 - Day Use proposes encouraging visitors to remove their own rubbish and only providing bins at high use sites. Encouraging visitors to be responsible for removing their own rubbish is also referred to in other sections in Part E. | No |
| 32.4 - Recreational Activities and Use - Day-Use | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 32.5 - Recreational Activities and Use - Bushwalking | | | | |
| 172 | Suggests that the Malgana and Nanda claim groups, through the Malgana and Nanda Working Groups, be consulted about the precise location of proposed walk trails prior to their planning to ensure that the placement of walk trails does not result in an increased risk to Indigenous heritage sites and places of significance. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. The protection of Indigenous cultural heritage from potential impacts and consulting with claim groups is covered in strategies outlined in Section 26 - Indigenous Heritage, these being: "protecting and maintaining Indigenous cultural heritage by complying with the relevant State and Commonwealth legislation and Department policy; managing and regularly monitoring threatening process...and visitor activities to ensure Indigenous cultural heritage is not adversely affected; liaising with and involving local Aboriginal people and relevant organisations, government agencies, organisations and community groups, to improve the protection, conservation and, where necessary, restoration of Indigenous cultural heritage including establishment of cultural heritage management reference groups; and consulting with Malgana and Nanda on management plans and proposed public works to identify cultural heritage and cultural resources." | No |
| 173 | Acknowledges that bushwalking has been considered and managed. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 32.6 - Recreational Activities - Recreational Fishing | | | | |
| 174 | Acknowledges that fishing has been considered and managed. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 32.7 - Recreational Activities - Recreational Boating | | | | |
| 175 | Acknowledges that boating has been considered and managed. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------|--|-----|
| 32.8 - Recreational Activities - Water-based Activities | | | | |
| 176 | Acknowledges that water-based activities have been considered and managed. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 32.9 - Recreational Activities - Scenic Flights and Other Aircraft | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 32.10 - Recreational Activities - Non-commercial, Education and Not-for-Profit Groups | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 32.11 - Recreational Activities - Special Events | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 33. Tourism and Commercial Operations | | | | |
| 177 | Suggests that the following text about the Landbank project be added to the plan, "Landbank works by identifying potential tourism accommodation sites and then undertaking the planning and approvals procedures that will make the sites investor ready. Planning and preparation for Landbank sites can include initiatives like a flora and fauna survey, a heritage assessment, Native Title clearance or a groundwater study. Requirements will vary from one site to another." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text updated to include most of this new information about the Landbank project. However, eight paragraphs is too detailed and this information was summarised. | Yes |
| | "Part of the Landbank project includes the search for suitable tourist accommodation sites within lands managed by DEC. The intention is to improve the range of experiences available for visitors and to generate tourism contribution to the biodiversity of our national parks and other conservation lands within Western Australia. High quality facilities and practices will permit enjoyment and heightened appreciation of both natural and cultural environments throughout the State, which in turn creates an opportunity for investment in the broader community and environment of an area." | | | |
| | "Landbank has the capacity to provide for different types of tourist accommodation appropriate to the area and in proximity to some of Western Australia's most iconic places and landmarks. In the case of protected areas, remote area eco-retreats like safari camps and lodges are the common focus." | | | |
| | "In Western Australia, there is considerable potential to establish a spread of high quality ecotourism ventures within national parks and other conservation lands. This will help to improve access to and enjoyment of key visitor icons, heighten appreciation of the environment and add to income generation and therefore long term sustainability of conservation estate." | | | |
| | "Where circumstances permit, this will lead to high yielding product and improved capacity for tourism to show its credentials. This can mean enabling a tourist operation's green credentials or its capacity to provide benefits to local people. It is part of a wider corporate trend to better recognising the requirements of environment and better incorporating and accommodating community. Good examples of high quality low impact accommodation on DEC managed lands include the Karijini Eco Retreat | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---------|---|-----|
| | and the Ningaloo Reef Retreat." | | | |
| | "Western Australia's conservation lands present other benefits when it comes to the establishment and operation of low impact accommodation and associated activities. The DEC, as manager of these lands, is able to apply conditions not only on the operation of the accommodation facilities but also the range of commercial activities that are linked to the facility. This provides the capacity to guide activities in a way that ensure they are consistent with wider environmental and cultural attributes, and in accordance with planning and on-going management of the conservation estate. These outcomes are more difficult to achieve outside the conservation estate." | | | |
| | "A spread of high quality eco tourism ventures on DEC land will expand the range of visitor experiences and help to establish Western Australia's credentials as a nature-based and cultural tourism destination. It will permit heightened appreciation of Western Australia's varied environmental and cultural assets. For the tourism industry in WA it will mean being able to compete with other parts of Australia and with places like Africa, for high quality cultural and eco tourism niche markets that increasingly wish to see tourism contributing to the sustainability of a destination." | | | |
| | "A number of areas within the management area have the capacity to support accommodation and the Landbank project has already considered sites within the Francois Peron National Park. To date no site has been chosen for more intensive consideration and any potential tourism project would be preceded with considerable assessment of the range of values in the area. Tourism projects will be fully integrated into wider park management." | | | |
| 34. Visitor Safety | | | | |
| 178 | Suggests that safety associated with fishing is important for recreational fisherman and is the responsibility of individuals, depending on their abilities, experience and weather and swell conditions. Advises that anglers have developed equipment and methods to allow difficult areas to be fished safely and effectively. Most of these have been from Australian Angler's Association Western Australian (AAAWA) members. Rock fishing is risky but can be carried out by people who are aware of the risks and suggests that AAAWA should be the only body to make decisions on restricting access based on "safe fishing" criteria and the provision of facilities such as rock "anchor points". | 2 (f)?? | Noted. Comment contributes options that are not feasible. DEC has and will continue to consult with and receive advice from fishing stakeholders regarding fishing safety in the planning area, on which management decisions will be based. However, within national parks and other conservation reserves in the planning area, DEC has the legal responsibility to make the final decision regarding these issues. | No |
| 35. Domestic Animals | | | | |
| 179 | Suggests that Bernier and Dorre Islands be added to the list of areas where dogs will not be permitted, on page 151. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. All island nature reserves added to this list. | Yes |
| 36. Bernier, Dorre and Koks Islands | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 36.1 Bernier, Dorre and Koks Islands - Visitor Access | | | | |
| 180 | Does not support the proposal that Dorre Island is changed from "prohibited access" to "limited access" and suggests that the "prohibited access" | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. Dorre Island will be retained as "prohibited access" and strategies 1 | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|---|-----|
| | <p>classification be retained because: a) the presence of the highly contagious wart-like/carcinoma disease in the resident western barred bandicoots on Bernier Island, but its absence on Dorre Island. Dorre Island therefore requires strict quarantine conditions as research suggests that the causative virus can persist in the environment and be carried on footwear etc. Therefore, there is the risk that visitors moving between Bernier and Dorre Islands may carry the virus with them and infect the Dorre Island western barred bandicoot populations on this island; b) due to current drought conditions, both islands are highly susceptible wildfire, the most likely ignition sources being from human activity; c) visitation increases the risk of the introduction of pets or weeds (Bernier Island has infestations of buffel grass while Dorre Island is free from this species and its introduction has the potential to decimate the spinifex hummock grasslands of the island) and d) prohibiting visitation and provide the highest level of protection possible for at least one of these two islands is sensible, cautious and justifiable, given their high global conservation value.</p> | | <p>and 2 changed to reflect this. Rationale, as outlined in this comment and comment number 181 to 183, added to the plan.</p> | |
| 181 | <p>Does not support the proposal that Dorre Island is changed from "prohibited access" to "limited access" and suggests that the "prohibited access" classification be retained because: a) both Bernier and Dorre Islands are of extremely high importance for the conservation of the western barred bandicoot, banded hare wallaby, the Shark Bay rufous hare wallaby sub species, the boodie and the Shark Bay mouse, which are only found naturally on one or both of these two islands and access to the public to both islands should be minimised; b) in the western barred bandicoot population on Bernier Islands, there is a highly contagious viral disease causing warts, cancers and death and can be transferred on clothing, utensils and camping equipment. The Dorre Island population of western barred bandicoots appears to be free of this disease, so Dorre Island should be treated with the highest quarantine conditions and the movements of people from Bernier to Dorre Islands needs to be minimised; c) current drought conditions make both islands extremely susceptible to wildfire and the most likely source of ignition is from human activity. Wildfire has the potential to destroy the habitat of these threatened species and reduce their populations; d) visitation risks the introduction of pets, pest animals and weeds. Dorre Island is free from buffel grass, but there is a population on Bernier Island. If buffel grass should establish on Dorre Island, it will out-compete native vegetation and destroy habitat, in particular spinifex hummock grasslands. Dorre Islands needs the highest level of protection from this weed; e) a key performance indicator in the plan is to reduce the level of unauthorised camping on both Bernier and Dorre Island. Permitting day use on Dorre Islands will increase unauthorised camping, making this criterion difficult to meet; f) the plan outlines that the "prohibited access" of Dorre Island is difficult to enforce. Given the island's importance for flora and fauna, this should not be used as a justification to changing this to "limited access; and g) it is a sensible, cautious and entirely justifiable approach to continue to prohibit visitation to Dorre Island and to provide the highest level of protection for at least one of these islands with such high global conservation value.</p> | 1 (d) | <p>Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 180.</p> | Yes |
| 182 | <p>Does not support providing access to Dorre Island because: a) the relictual native mammal populations are some of the highest and most at risk values</p> | | | |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------|---|-----|
| | of the planning area and providing access increases the risk from wildfire, diseases, disturbance and does not maintain the level of protection that these values warrant; b) according to the CALM Act, the purpose of nature reserve precludes recreation, which is allowed for in the purpose of national parks and conservation parks and suggests that DEC should not allow an activity that does not meet the Department's legislative framework; c) the argument that recreation currently occurs but is not enforced is not sound. Protection should be based on the values at risk and the most effective methods of preventing these. If additional resources are required, these should be sought, rather than using the lack of resources to threaten the values which require protection. | | | |
| 183 | Suggests that the statement, "The Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserves Management Plan (2000) recommended that access to Dorre Island be changed to "limited access area" to be consistent with Bernier Island." is questioned. | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 180. | Yes |
| 37. Shark Bay Islands | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 38. Peron Peninsula | | | | |
| 184 | Concerned about proposed increases in access and eco-accommodation at Guichenault Point and Dubaut Creek as both sites are high tide roosts for migratory waders. Increases in visitor numbers will cause more disturbance to roosting birds, which use vital energy resources. Birds returning from migration are moulting to non-breeding plumage. The moulting process has high energy demands and the birds must have sufficient energy stored to undertake long distance migration. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. The proposed developments will be located well away from roosting areas for migratory birds. In addition, site development plans will need to address all potential environmental impacts and issues, prior to any works commencing. | No |
| 38.1 Peron Peninsula - Recreation and Tourism Opportunities | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 38.2 Peron Peninsula - Access | | | | |
| 185 | Supports continued 2WD visitor access to the western side of South Peron, in particular Eagle Bluff, Fowler's Camp, Whalebone, Wilson Inlet, Shell Spit, Goulet Bluff and East Goulet Bluff. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. The plan outlines that 2WD visitor access to Eagle Bluff, Fowler's Camp, Whalebone, Goulet Bluff and Shell Spit will remain. Access to Wilson Inlet and East Goulet Bluff is currently 4WD accessible and 4WD visitor access to this site will remain. Table 7 and Map 6 updated to show 2WD access to Shell Spit and 4WD access to East Goulet Bluff. | Yes |
| 186 | Suggests that, where dedicated roads pass through the proposed South Peron Conservation Park, the Crown Land Road Reserve remains under the future control and management of the Shire of Shark Bay for future maintenance and road building. The Shire of Shark Bay receives funding from Main Roads WA to maintain these roads. | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. The Department agrees that management of the dedicated roads through South Peron are better controlled and managed by the Shire of Shark Bay. This could be facilitated through the development of a memorandum of understanding with the Shire of Shark Bay. Table 7 updated to show managing authority. | Yes |
| 38.3 Peron Peninsula - Recreation Use and Activities - Overnight Stays | | | | |
| 187 | Supports the statement that, if not managed appropriately, camping can have a detrimental impact on the natural environment and can result in a negative visitor experience. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------|---|-----|
| 188 | Supports the intention of DEC for continuing to apply a booking system for existing sites (on South Peron) and expanding this throughout the planning area. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 189 | Suggests that DEC be the responsible authority for the issuing of camping permits to the existing "Activity Centres" in the proposed South Peron Conservation Park. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or were considered during plan preparation. The development and management of a booking system for camping by DEC is outlined in Section 32.2 - Overnight Stays. | No |
| 38.4 Peron Peninsula - Tourism and Commercial Opportunities | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 38.5 Peron Peninsula - Domestic Animals | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 39. Nanga Peninsula | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 40. Zuytdorp Area | | | | |
| 190 | Suggests that the plan is inconsistent with the State Planning Policy support of the removal of unlawful dwellings (squatter shacks) on coastal crown land, in that the continued use of shacks constructed by commercial abalone fishers for use while fishing in the Zuytdorp area. In contrast, on Dirk Hartog Island the huts will be assessed for their structural integrity, safety and visual impacts. Suggests that allowing a small number of huts, although may not have a significant environmental impact, it sends the wrong message to the public (that DEC condones the construction and use of these huts on DEC managed estate) and may encourage the construction of more huts in the area, possibly having negative impacts on the World Heritage values of the area. Suggests that the huts in the Zuytdorp area undergo the same assessment process as proposed for the Dirk Hartog Island huts, to ensure consistency with the State Coastal Planning Strategy and the State Government Squatter Policy (July 1998 and January 1999). | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Given the low level of use and during a restricted season, consistent with the State Government Squatter Policy, commercial abalone fishing will continue to be permitted to use the shack. The text has been modified to clarify this. | Yes |
| 40.1 - Zuytdorp Area - Access | | | | |
| 191 | Suggests that the correct name of the emu proof fence is the State Barrier Fence. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Reference to the State Barrier Fence corrected. | Yes |
| 40.2 - Zuytdorp Area - Recreation Use and Activities | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 41. Edel Land | | | | |
| 192 | Suggest that current management by the existing rangers at Steep Point has been of a very high standard and their commonsense approach to acceptable visitor activities. The booking system works well to manage the site allocation and number of campers in these areas. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or were considered during plan preparation. Section 41.3 Edel Land - Recreation Use and Activities - Overnight Stays outlines that the booking arrangement for camping will remain in place. Section 41.2 Edel Land - Access outlines that a system of fees will continue to be applied for access to the proposed national park. | No |
| 41.1 - Edel Land - Recreation and Tourism Opportunities | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |

| 41.2 - Edel Land - Visitor Access | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------|---|-----|
| 193 | Does not support closing access between False Entrance and the Blowholes and removing access to excellent fishing and swimming locations including Crayfish Bay. Suggests that a 4WD track should be provided to maintain access to all these locations. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. The plan states that 4WD access between False Entrance and the Blowholes will remain, but, for safety reasons, will require a permit. | No |
| 194 | Concerned about the proposal to construct a 2WD access road to False Entrance, which has been protected in the past by restricting access to 4WD vehicles and anglers who are aware of the conditions and suitably equipped. Suggests that allowed 2WD access would allow inexperienced visitors into a dangerous area and recommend that DEC provides only 4WD access from Steep Point south along the coast, with small camping areas and environmental toilets. | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. Access to False Entrance will be retained at the current standard and a 2WD access road will not be constructed. This section and Table 14 changed to reflect this. However, the proposal to develop a minor campsite with limited facilities will be retained (as outlined in Section 41.3 - Edel Land - Recreation Use and Activities - Overnight Stays). | Yes |
| 195 | Concerned about the proposals to upgrade the road and facilities at False Entrance because, a) currently the area is extremely remote and the harsh environment does not encourage ill-prepared campers, b) the area suitable for fishing at False Entrance is a small narrow rock ledge, and is suitable only for a very smaller number of anglers at any one time, c) wave surges makes fishing difficult, d) there are only a very limited number of sheltered camping areas in the dunes, e) the high cliffs (up to 60m in places) are very dangerous and those who currently visit are very aware of these dangers, f) traditional bait fishing is difficult due to the onshore reef at the northern and southern ends of the bay, g) key target fish species are tailor and long tom which are not good eating and opportunities for popular eating species are minimal, h) improved camping and road conditions will ruin the area, i) improving access will increase visitation by inexperienced overseas visitors and j) increased visitation to the area will be too difficult to manage by the existing ranger staff, which will lead to more damage, vandalism and unwanted tracks in the area, devaluing the current wilderness camping and fishing experience | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 194. | Yes |
| 196 | Suggests that Steep Point be promoted as an alternative to False Entrance because a) there are many camping and fishing opportunities suitable for families and "grey nomads", b) it provides a larger, safer fishing ledge, protected from the tidal surge and closer to the water's edge making landing fish easier, c) there are a wide range of fishing opportunities for popular eating fish, d) there are opportunities for surfing, body-boarding, snorkelling and swimming and d) the current permit system ensures that most visitors comply with the rules. | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 194. | Yes |
| 197 | Does not support opening up False Entrance to more visitors because, a) the beaches at Crayfish Bay and False Entrance contain a unique Tailor fishery where this sportfish are caught and released without harm to the fish. More visitors, without this catch and release mentality would see a reduction in this fishery; b) conditions are hostile, it is a tough place to camp and there is nothing to attract tourists; c) the cliffs and huge swells are extremely dangerous for inexperienced visitors, especially when medical help can be hours away; d) there are no other attractions aside from fishing in the area (no flora, fauna, freshwater or firewood), e) campers could damage the dunes looking for firewood; f) due to the bad corrugations, the road into False Entrance would require constant upgrade and maintenance, money | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 194. | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|---|-----|
| | better spent elsewhere; g) opening up the area to more visitors would destroy the area as a unique fishing wilderness. | | | |
| 198 | Does not support plans to make False Entrance more accessible for members of the general public because: a) the current cliff anglers who visit False Entrance are dedicated and experienced; b). the area is very dangerous and is subject to very high ocean energy, safe fishable platforms are 15m above the water, uneven, dangerously sharp, crumbly and unstable and fishers wear safety harnesses and self-inflating safety jackets and use anchor points; c) ensuring the safety of naive visitors would require the restriction of access to many of the areas visited by anglers which would be a tragedy; and d) providing access for day-visitors would take a big increase in resources to ensure greater safety and enjoyment. | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 194. | Yes |
| 199 | Advises that the current rangers on Carrarang Station have an excellent system which control visitors to Crayfish Bay and False Entrance and ensures those that do go there are adequately prepared. The area has an impressive safety record due to this current management and the responsible nature of the current visitors. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes a general statement and no change is sought. | No |
| 200 | Applauds DEC for improvements to access and facilities for Western Australia's wilderness areas, particularly in the South West. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes a general statement and no change is sought. | No |
| 201 | Suggests that future plans for the area be modelled around restricting not encouraging visitor numbers and that roads not be upgraded to improve access. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. Generally, across the planning area, the intent is to retain access at current standards and maintaining visitor numbers at current levels, particularly for ex-pastoral lease areas where, to date, visitor numbers have been restricted. | No |
| 202 | Suggests that anglers continue to be allowed to access the coastal cliffs between False Entrance and Steep Point to continue to enjoy the unique angling opportunities of the area. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. The plan outlines that access to remote areas such as Crayfish Bay will require a permit. Anglers will continue to be able to access these areas with such a permit. | No |
| 203 | Supports the current management on Edel Land - the current rangers are quick to act on people who do the wrong thing, especially in relation to the natural environment. The care for the area has improved and the natural environment has not deteriorated. In the 1980s there were tracks everywhere, but now only the well established tracks are used and the visitor impact on the environment is minimal. To gain access to the area, permits and a bond are required with rules and obligations and safety is a personal responsibility | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes a general statement and no change is sought. | No |
| 204 | Does not support the proposed changes to False Entrance access because: a) it is not an ideal holiday location because of strong winds, heat, a lack of shade, a lack of swimming opportunities and a dangerous coastline (these conditions keeps visitor numbers low and attracts only keen specialised anglers); b) it is a 4 hour drive from Geraldton or Carnarvon and visitors would not drive this distance just to see cliffs and there are no other activities available; c) current visitors are keen, experienced anglers and opening the area up to other visitors would drive current visitors away; d) spending large amounts of money to improve facilities and the roads conditions would be a poor use of taxpayers money; e) sending inexperienced visitors (especially overseas visitors) into such a dangerous area and a long way from help would be a disaster; f) the only attraction to the area is the quality of the unique sport tailor fishery and increasing | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 194. | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|--|-----|
| | numbers could destroy this fishery; g) the limited number of rock ledges at False Entrance does not support large numbers of anglers; h) alternative opportunities are available at Steep Point; i) there are opportunities to view the cliffs at Kalbarri, which are accessible by 2WD; j) there are endless other spots along the WA coastline that are easily accessible from sealed roads and offer opportunities for tourists. The coast between Steep Point and False Entrance should be kept as a wilderness experience for those who want to make the effort to see it. | | | |
| 205 | Suggests that the vermin proof fence track north of Kalbarri be developed as an opportunity to view the Zuytdorp Cliffs, due to the more direct route to the cliffs and their proximity to Kalbarri. | 2 (e) | Noted. Comment is among several divergent viewpoints and the strategies included in the plan are considered the best option. Access to the Zuytdorp Cliffs via the State Barrier Fence is much more difficult and all access requires permission from the Agricultural Protection Board, through the Department of Agriculture and Food Western Australia (for access along the fence) and from the Western Australian Museum (for access to the Zuytdorp shipwreck. The long-term intent for this area is that it become nature reserve and, as a result, the Department does not support improved access and increased visitor numbers through this area to the Zuytdorp Cliffs. | No |
| 206 | Supports the proposal for a permit to access Crayfish Bay. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 207 | Suggests that the bond already in place be increased and the money used to formalise 4WD access and fencing off sensitive areas. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. Visitor and camping fees are set by the Minister for Environment. | No |
| 208 | See comment number 203. | | | |
| 209 | See comment number 204. | | | |
| 210 | See comment number 205. | | | |
| 211 | See comment number 206. | | | |
| 212 | See comment number 207. | | | |
| 213 | Does not support proposed changes to access to False Entrance as it would be a shame if an untapped and rugged coastline were to be urbanised. Leave our unique coastline alone. | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 194. | Yes |
| 214 | Does not support the closure of the area between False Entrance and the Blowholes, removing access to several excellent fishing and swimming locations such as Crayfish Bay. Suggests that a 4WD track and some camping sites should be provided to maintain access to these locations. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. See discussion associated with comment number 194. | No |
| 215 | Does not support the proposal to construct a 2WD road to False Entrance. Current 4WD access to this area has limited visitation to people who are aware and prepared for the conditions are suitably equipped. Opening this area up for general 2WD access will allow an uncontrolled number of inexperienced visitors access to a dangerous area, a long way from help. Suggests that access to False Entrance remains as 4WD. | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 194. | Yes |
| 216 | Suggests that access from Steep Point, south along the coast including Crayfish Bay and adjacent locations, be retained for 4WDs. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. See discussion associated with comment number 194. | No |
| 217 | Refers to the text on page 181 that, "day-use will not be permitted in turtle nesting areas during turtle nesting season" and that at Shelter Bay, "there is a need to develop alternative areas away from the coastline...to minimise environmental impacts on nesting turtles." and concerned that no specific strategies are included to implement this (as is the case for access to Turtle Bay on Dirk Hartog Island and the plan outlines, "not permitting access to the beach north of Cape Levillain when turtle nesting occurs." Suggests that a similar strategy in relation to access to Shelter Bay is added to the sections about Edel Land. | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. The extent of turtle nesting at Shelter Bay is unknown and monitoring is required to determine this. Section 41.3 - Edel Land - Wildlife Encounters has a strategy, "commencing turtle population monitoring at Shelter Bay." Another strategy added to the camping section "if monitoring indicates the use of Shelter Bay by nesting turtles, regulating access to parts of Shelter Bay when turtle nesting occurs." | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|--|-----|
| 218 | Suggests that the plan proposed the same level of protection for nesting turtles at Shelter Bay as at Turtle Bay on Dirk Hartog Island. Advises that the Shelter Bay turtle population is the southernmost known nesting population and is therefore significant. Suggests that access to Shelter Bay should be closed during the turtle nesting season to prevent impacts on nesting turtles. The fact that greater camping opportunities are proposed at Shelter Bay suggests that DEC is prepared to sacrifice this population. | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 217 above. | Yes |
| 41.3 - Edel Land - Recreation Use and Activities - Overnight Stays | | | | |
| 219 | Suggests that Table 15 contains the proposal to close Shelter Bay during turtle nesting season. | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 217 | Yes |
| 220 | Concerned that many visitors tow trailers and have heavily loaded vehicles and can get bogged on tracks and damage tracks on hills and crests and contributes to significant corrugations. Suggests that this be addressed with track realignments, maintenance, driver education, the establishment of one-way tracks on crests with limited visibility and more regular maintenance. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. This issue of realigning and rationalising vehicle access across the planning area is addresses in Section 30 - Vehicle Access. | No |
| 221 | Does not support upgrading False Entrance to 2WD access and camping because: a) False Entrance on its own does not justify such a long drive when the main focus for tourists is Peron Peninsula; b) False Entrance, with high winds and barren landscape is not suitable for 2WD camping, but more appropriate for well organised 4WD campers, who enjoy a challenge, do not mind rough conditions and explore Edel Land in their vehicle, maximising their visit; and c) it would encourage casual sightseers into hazardous coastal areas raises safety issues in a remote location. | 1 (d) | Noted. Comment proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives. See discussion associated with comment number 194. | Yes |
| 222 | Suggests that protected camping should be provided on Tamala Station overlooking Henri Freycinet Harbour, which would provide more options for casual fishing, relaxing or day trips to False Entrance and the Zuytdorp Cliffs. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. The part of Tamala Station overlooking Henri Freycinet Harbour is proposed to remain as pastoral lease and so is outside the planning area and not part of DEC-managed estate. | No |
| 41.3 - Edel Land - Recreation Use and Activities - Recreational Fishing | | | | |
| 223 | The coastline from Steep Point south provides some unique land based fishing opportunities for anglers from all over Australia. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes a general statement and no change is sought. | No |
| 41.4 - Edel Land - Visitor Safety | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 41.5 - Edel Land - Tourism and Commercial Operations | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 41.6 - Edel Land - Domestic Animals | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 42. Dirk Hartog Island | | | | |
| 224 | Advises that Herald Bay is the site of Captain Denham's astronomical observatory, a number of pearling camps, fishing camps, von Bibra station and wells and Quoin Bluff historic site. Suggests that an archaeological survey is carried out for any proposed site to avoid impacting any historic sites | 2 (c) and (d) | Noted. Comments makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation and is beyond the scope of the plan. An archaeological survey will be undertaken as part of the site development process which occurs prior to any works occurring. The protection of these sites is covered in a number of strategies outlined in Section 278 - Non-Indigenous Heritage. | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-----|--|---------------|---|-----|
| 225 | Advises that the Notch Point recreational boating or 4WD camp should not be sited on the existing known pearling sites. | 2 (c) and (d) | Noted. Comments makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation and is beyond the scope of the plan. The impacts of recreation developments on cultural heritage will be assessed as part of the site development process. | No |
| 226 | Does not agree with the current level of activity for the existing homestead area being a medium existing activity centre (medium yellow circle) and suggests it should be a major existing activity centre (large yellow circle) or a major proposed activity centre (large red circle) as there are proposal to provide a range of accommodation at the homestead including camping. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. The text and Map 8 changed to show the homestead as a major existing activity centre. | Yes |
| 227 | Does not support the proposal to establish a DEC operations base at Herald Bay, separate from the existing homestead infrastructure because: a) it would result in a duplication of infrastructure; b) more synergies can be developed with one entry point to the national park; c) one entry point would provide savings for all users (buildings, accommodation, power and water); d) it would confine activity to a limited area of the proposed national park and e) DEC operations would be visible to all entering tourists. | 2 (e) | Noted. Comment is one of several divergent viewpoints and the strategies of the plan are still considered the best option. A central location for the Department's operation's base is more appropriate and will enable better servicing of the proposed recreation sites on the island, particularly given that these are, for the most part, located on the northern end of the island. In addition, if access across Tetraddon Loop is cut, then access to the northern part of the island would be restricted if the Department's operations base is located at the homestead. | No |
| 228 | Suggests that the vision for Dirk Hartog Island should also incorporate a commitment to support the use of sustainable energy such as solar or wind power for accommodation and vehicles and best environmental practice for water, sewerage and drainage in both the freehold and DEC locations. | 2 (d) and (f) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan and contributes options that are not feasible. Specific issues relating to water, waste management and power are considered as part of the site development planning process and are too detailed for the management plan. Generally DEC aims for sustainable site developments wherever possible in an effort to ensure that impacts are minimised. The plan proposes that visitors be able to bring their own private vehicles to the island as currently occurs. Given there are no solar powered four wheel drive vehicles available on the current passenger vehicle market, this proposal is not possible, practical or cost-effective for either visitors bringing their own vehicles to the island or for DEC to provide these vehicles. | No |
| 229 | Does not support the statement that most people visiting the island stay overnight at one of four huts or camps and suggests this should be changed to, "Most people visiting the island by four wheel drive stay overnight at one of four huts or camps." Most people currently visiting Dirk Hartog Island stay at the homestead. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text changed to reflect this. | Yes |
| 230 | Does not support the statement, "Development of ecotourism accommodation on the freehold lots at the homestead and Sunday Island Bay has implications for visitor management, the ecological restoration project and the natural environment of the rest of the islands." and suggests that this be changed to, "Development of ecotourism accommodation on the freehold lots at the homestead and Sunday Island Bay has implications for visitor management that will positively impact on the provision of services for the proposed national park through the collection of fees and the availability of on-site infrastructure." | 2 (e) | Comment is one of several divergent viewpoints and the plan contains the best option. As described in <i>Section 42.2 Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Overnight Stays</i> , the Government agreement to acquire Dirk Hartog Island and establish a national park allowed for three freehold areas to be created and developed for ecotourism, with a maximum of 103, 95 and 212 units able to be constructed in each of these areas respectively. Although not outlined in the agreement, DEC estimates this proposal could result in between 1600 and 2500 people staying overnight on the island at any one. Given that the homestead currently provides accommodation for up to 14 people and there is a limit of 10 vehicles at any one time on the remainder of the island, development of units on just one of the freehold lots would increase visitor numbers on the island dramatically, leading to more vehicles, more visitor activity and more impacts on the natural values and the ecological restoration project. | No |
| 231 | Suggests that the focus list for recreation and tourism development on Dirk Hartog Island is not comprehensive or visionary enough and that a commitment to the use of solar power and best practice water and waste treatment should be added to the proposal, "to develop a limited number of | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. Specific issues relating to water, waste management and power are considered as part of the site development planning process and are too detailed for the management plan. Generally DEC aims for sustainable site developments wherever possible in an | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------|---|-----|
| | bush camping sites with alternative sites and styles of facilities" and that the provision of solar powered or charged vehicle access should be added to the proposal, "to initially limit the number of private vehicles on the island to 10 per day (including tour operator vehicles)." | | effort to ensure that impacts are minimised. The plan proposes that visitors be able to bring their own private vehicles to the island as currently occurs. Given there are no solar powered or electric four wheel drive vehicles available on the current market, this proposal is not possible, practical or cost-effective for either visitors bringing their own vehicles to the island or for DEC to provide these vehicles. | |
| 232 | Suggests that the number of service vehicles be excluded from the limit of 10 vehicles on the island per day. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. The plan refers to a limit of 10 private and tour operator vehicles. However, this limit applies to all vehicles on the island, including service vehicles, with the exception of Departmental vehicles. Consequently, the text and strategy 3 has been altered to state that the limit applies to all vehicles with the exception of Departmental vehicles. The Department will make efforts to ensure that the number of Departmental vehicles is kept to a minimum. | Yes |
| 233 | Suggests the addition of further scenic drive circuits such as a Wapet Recreation circuit, including Sandy Point, Charlie's Harbour, Herald Bay fenceline and Herald Bay Outcamp and a Herald Heights Loop including Herald Bay fenceline, Cliff Lookout, Tetradon Loop and Herald Bay Outcamp. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. A general comment that further scenic drives will be considered over the life of the plan has been added to Section 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreation Use and Activities - Scenic and Recreational Driving. | Yes |
| 234 | Suggests the provision of additional walktrails including the Blowholes walk (guests are dropped at Cliff Lookout and picked up at the blowholes), Surf Point walk and a Wapet Wilderness walk, including most of the 18 Wapet wells drilled in the 1950s and allowing visitors to see rock paddocks, pastoral infrastructure, outcamps, bush camps re-entrants yards and old campfires. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. There is a statement in Section 32.5 - <i>Recreation Activities and Use - Bushwalking</i> that other bushwalks may be developed as demand increases and after detailed planning, review of the management setting implications and public consultation. These additional walktrails may be considered in the future if there is a demand for them. | No |
| 235 | Suggests the development of an interpretive node at the homestead, in line with the proposal to locate the DEC operations base at the Homestead. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. The provision of interpretation is outlined in Section 53 - Education, Interpretation and Information and strategy 3 in this section discusses the provision of interpretation at key entry points, including the Dirk Hartog Island homestead. However, the proposal to locate the Departmental operations bases at Herald Bay will remain, as per the discussion associated with comment number 227. | No |
| 236 | Suggests that recreation and tourism infrastructure and boundaries of the proposed freehold land associated with the homestead and Sunday Island Bay would need to be assessed according to Section F of the State Planning Policy No. 2.6 State Coastal Planning Policy (Development in Cyclone Prone Areas), which is applicable north of latitude 30°. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. The boundaries of the freehold lots have already been determined and are outlined in the Agreement between the State Government and Hypermarket Pty. Ltd., a process which the Department for Planning and Infrastructure was responsible for. The development of these freehold lots will not be carried out by the Department and will need to satisfy the statutory process outlined in this comment. | No |
| 42.1 Dirk Hartog Island - Visitor Access | | | | |
| 237 | Supports the proposal to maintain the current low levels of 4WD access via a barge and retaining only a few shacks on the northern end of the island, limiting environmental damage. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 238 | See comment number 237. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 239 | Supports the proposal for an island based vehicle hire system, but suggests this should be based on the provision of electrically solar charged or solar powered vehicles, providing a commitment to a total eco approach on the island. | 2 (f) | Noted. Comment contributes options that are not feasible. Given there are no solar powered four wheel drive vehicles available on the current passenger vehicle market, it is not possible, practical or cost-effective for DEC to provide these vehicles. | No |
| 240 | Suggests that, although development of the freehold lots will increase visitor numbers staying overnight, the mechanism provided in this plan will | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment based on incorrect or factually unclear information. Regardless of whether the vehicle limit of 10 on the island on any one day | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|--|-----|
| | regulate the numbers of vehicles and the use of electric powered vehicles will minimise the impacts on tracks. Visitor fees will increase, while impacts will reduce. The ecological restoration program is a long-term program for the island and the elimination of feral animals will take some time. In this time the vehicle protocol should have been resolved so impacts of visitors on the ecological restoration program will be minimised. | | remains over the life of the plan, the development of the freehold lots will see a considerable increase in visitor numbers that will have considerably greater impacts, even if they only explore the island on foot. The only practical way of transporting these increased visitor numbers around the island will be via vehicle, so any development of the freehold lots will see a need to increase the vehicle limit, which will increase impacts on the island's natural values. Given there are no solar powered four wheel drive vehicles available on the current passenger vehicle market, it is not possible, practical or cost-effective for DEC to provide these vehicles. Regardless of what powers a vehicle, the movement of vehicles over tracks on the island will have an impact. | |
| 241 | Suggests that the Department should consider a commitment to using solar powered or solar-charged electric vehicles or four-wheel drive buggies, similar to golfing buggies in the proposed national park. | 2 (f) | Noted. Comment contributes options that are not feasible. Given there are no solar powered four wheel drive vehicles available on the current passenger vehicle market, this proposal is not possible, practical or cost-effective for DEC to provide these vehicles. | No |
| 242 | Does not agree with the interpretation in the plan regarding the use of airstrips in the State Government agreement to acquire Dirk Hartog Island. Suggests that the agreement does not state that the "non-exclusive" licence for access and use refers to the airstrip near the homestead and the airstrip currently used may not be the one to be used by DEC. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Section 3.10 (b) of the Agreement between the State Government of Western Australia and Hypermarket Pty. Ltd. in relation to Dirk Hartog Island states that the State will grant a "non-exclusive licence to Hypermarket to access and use the airstrip on the island." The plan has been changed to reflect this. | Yes |
| 243 | Does not support a total ban on access to turtle breeding beaches because: a) the proposal to establish an eco-camp at Cape Levillain will provide accommodation for eco tourists who will pay a premium to observe turtles with controlled rather than ad hoc access; b) these eco tourists will pay for DEC control and assistance ensuring turtle activity is not compromised; c) protocols used at Ningaloo will be adopted and refined; d) interpretation and information will be provided to guests; e) guests will be registered as volunteers and DEC promotes Landscape tours to Dirk Hartog Island for volunteers to tag turtle; f) permitting visitors to interact with turtles will develop greater support for environmental concerns; g) fees paid by these eco tourists will provide funds to DEC to develop wildlife encounters; g) the numbers of guests will only be small and h) hides rather than direct access to the beach will be developed. DEC will be permitted to use the proposed eco-camp during these Landscape Expeditions. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. The lessees of the proposed Cape Levillain eco-camp must comply with the criteria outlined in the Agreement between the State Government of Western Australia and Hypermarket Pty. Ltd. in relation to Dirk Hartog Island. To minimise impacts on the turtles and turtle nesting sites and to generally protect the environment, the lessee must i) ensure that the development and any improvements are set back from the boundary of the lease, so that no artificial light emitted from the lease is directly or indirectly visible from any turtle nesting beach or 1 nautical mile out to sea from any beach or site; ii) ensure any structures on the lease are designed with a minimum use of outdoor light; iii) ensure all outdoor lights are sensor operated and have covers to deflect light downwards, to prevent light being directed into the sky; iv) ensure that all toilet facilities in the lease are self contained with no leaching of nutrients to the external environment; and v) ensure all information is given to the lessee about appropriate access and activities on turtle nesting beaches to avoid impact on turtle breeding activities as required by CEO of DEC and shall observe all instructions in relation to protection of nesting turtles and rookeries. These criteria have been added to the management plan and strategy 2 has been changed to read, "ensuring that any eco-development on leasehold land at Cape Levillain and access to turtle breeding beaches in the area comply with the criteria outlined above." Strategy 4 has been changed to read, "monitoring any the operations of any eco-development on leasehold land at Cape Levillain and access to turtle-breeding beaches to ensure that turtles are not impacted." Any eco-development will also require site development plans and an environmental management plan. | Yes |
| 244 | Support the proposal to prohibit unlicensed ATVs and motorbikes but suggest that the use of electrically powered solar vehicles should be promoted. | 2 (f) | Noted. Comment contributes options that are not feasible. Given there are no solar powered four wheel drive vehicles available on the current passenger vehicle market, this proposal is not possible, practical or cost-effective for DEC to provide these vehicles. In addition, any vehicle, regardless of type would have an impact on the tracks on Dirk Hartog Island. | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------|---|-----|
| 245 | Supports limited access to beaches north of Cape Leveillain with suitable DEC supervision but does not support the exclusion of access from these beaches as it would provide an opportunity to provide funding to DEC from minimal visitation. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Even with funding via visitor fees, DEC would not have the staff or resources to provide regular and continued supervision of tourists from the proposed eco-camp viewing turtles. However, any access to turtle nesting beaches would need to comply with the criteria outlined in the Agreement between the State Government of Western Australia and Hypermarket Pty. Ltd. in relation to Dirk Hartog Island, which have been added to the plan. See discussion associated with comment number 243. | Yes |
| 246 | Suggests an additional strategy for this section, "Co-opting and cooperating with all stakeholders in achieving the objective." | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. There is a strategy in Section 30- Visitor Access, which states, "consistent with the criteria for the appropriate visitor management setting and after consultation with relevant stakeholders, providing public vehicle access on dedicated roads, CALM Act roads and tracks shown on Maps 6, 7 and 8 and listed in Tables 7, 11, 14 and 18." | No |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Wildlife Encounters | | | | |
| 247 | Suggests that the turtle monitoring program at Turtle Bay has occurred for some time and has limited funds. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. Issues of program funding are too detailed for a management plan. | No |
| 248 | Supports prohibiting uncontrolled public access at Turtle Bay but suggests that an eco-camp and program of wildlife interaction be developed at Turtle Bay with the absolute proviso that the turtle activity is not compromised. Such a program would provide funding to DEC and a unique wildlife viewing opportunity. Suggests that the plan should not focus on the negative impacts but should propose the development of wildlife encounters with turtles in a positive way and that this will encourage research into establish safe ways of observing turtle nesting and hatchlings, including remote observation platforms or close hides. These could also be used to observe the black and white wren and sea birds. Suggests that a strategy is included in this section to reflect this. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Any access to turtle nesting beaches would need to comply with the criteria outlined in the Agreement between the State Government of Western Australia and Hypermarket Pty. Ltd. in relation to Dirk Hartog Island, which have been added to the plan. See discussion associated with comment number 243 and 245. | Yes |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Scenic and Recreational Driving | | | | |
| 249 | Suggests additional scenic and recreational driving circuits including a Wapet Circuit and a Herald Heights Loop. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. A general comment that further scenic drives will be considered over the life of the plan has been added to this section. | Yes |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Overnight Stays | | | | |
| 250 | Suggests that upgrading existing huts or developing new camping facilities should be done in partnership with the current Dirk Hartog Island lessees, given the experience of the lessees and the infrastructure available. Suggests that the plan also promote sustainable use and green technology in these developments. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or was considered during plan preparation. Throughout the plan, the Department aims for sustainable site developments wherever possible in an effort to ensure that impacts are minimised. Site development plans, which are prepared prior to any site works taking place, ensures that environmental impacts are limited and that use will be sustainable. Site development planning also involves consultation with key stakeholders. | No |
| 251 | Suggests that any reference to the use of the shearing shed at Sandy Point by DEC be removed from the plan as these are still owned by the current Dirk Hartog Island lessees and no agreement regarding their fate has been reached. | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment based on unclear or factually incorrect information. Reference to Sandy Point shearing shed removed from plan. | Yes |
| 252 | Suggests that the ratios for the proposed accommodation developments on the freehold blocks are incorrect and should be removed from the plan. | 2 (g) | Noted. Comment based on unclear or factually incorrect information. The maximum number of units permitted on the freehold lots at Sunday Island Bay | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------|--|-----|
| | | | and at the existing and adjacent homestead lots is outlined in the Agreement between the State Government of Western Australia and Hypermarket Pty. Ltd. in relation to Dirk Hartog Island, this being a total of 103 and 95 units of 90 square metres on the adjacent homestead lot and the Sunday Island Bay lot respectively and a total of 212 units of 200 square metres on the existing homestead lot. On the assumption that the maximum possible number of units are built on each freehold lot and that a 90 square metre unit could accommodate 2-4 people and a 200 square metre unit could accommodate 6-8 people, the figures provided in the management plan for overnight visitors in the freehold lots are correct. Given that the submitter does not provide any alternative calculations, the existing figures will remain in the plan. | |
| 253 | Does not support the proposal that Herald Bay should be closed for camping because of its heritage values and neutral location. Suggests that the beach in front of the Herald Bay dividing fence and the outcamp be maintained as camping staging area for recreational driving and walking tracks. | 2 (e) | Noted. Comment is one of several divergent viewpoints and the plan contains the best option. Once the Department's operations base has been constructed in the location, it will not be suitable for camping. Prior to the construction of the operations base, site development plans will be prepared to ensure that a location is chosen that does not impact on the heritage and natural values in the area. | No |
| 254 | Suggests that any proposed camping area at Cape Ransonnet should be located well away from the beach area as it would come under great pressure from boats from Steep Point and would be difficult to manage as users may not necessarily abide by a permit system and rubbish and debris would become a problem. Suggests that the authorisation come from Steep Point. | 2 (e) | Noted. Comment is one of several divergent viewpoints and the plan contains the best option. The management plan only proposes a minor camping site to be developed in this area. This will be to provide a place for visitors to camp overnight, while waiting to transport their vehicle to Shelter Bay on the barge, which usually occurs in the early morning. The specific location of the camping area will subject to the preparation of a site development plan to ensure that impacts on natural values are minimised. | No |
| 255 | Suggests that the key point relating to the development of eco-accommodation in the freehold areas is too negative. There is no description of what the likely impacts will be, suggesting that only negative impacts are possible. Suggests that this key point be changed to, "The development of eco accommodation and the freehold lots may have environmental impacts that can be both positive and negative but, that in cooperation with the freehold owners and the adoption of this plan can be managed to advantage. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. The plan clearly states in the text that the expected impacts of the development of accommodation in the freehold lots are uncertain, but likely to be significant, given that visitor numbers could increase from 14 at the homestead and 10 vehicles on the remainder of the island to a possible 1600-2500. These figures are significant and will result in significant impacts, some positive, but also negative. An assessment of these impacts can only be made once the development proposals have been formally prepared, at which point they will need to be assessed by the EPA. Consequently, it is beyond the scope of the plan to make detailed comments about the likely impacts and how these might be managed. However, this key point was changed to state, "The development of eco-accommodation and the freehold lots is likely to have environmental impacts on the island and these will be assessed once development proposals have been prepared. | Yes |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Day-Use | | | | |
| 256 | Suggests that the statement, "Due to the proposed development of eco-tourism accommodation with the freehold lots on Dirk Hartog Island, there will be greater demand for the development of day-use sites..." is incorrect and suggests that increased demand for day-use sites will be entirely due to the creation of the national park and the type of access permitted. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. The statement changed to, "Creation of the proposed national park and the proposed development of eco-tourism accommodation with the freehold lots on Dirk Hartog Island, will increase demand for the development of day-use sites..." | Yes |
| 257 | Suggests that additional day-use sites on Dirk Hartog Island should be developed including: Sandy Point spit for its location and abundance of ocean activities; selected Wapet bore locations for cultural interest and surrounding landscapes; Herald Heights for scenery and Broughs Hollow | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. In Section 32.4 - Day Use, the plan states that other sites may be developed as demand increases and after detailed planning, review of the management setting implications and public consultation. This will apply to | No |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|-----|
| | for its pastoral interest. | | these proposed sites. | |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Bushwalking | | | | |
| 258 | Suggests that additional bushwalks be developed on Dirk Hartog Island including: those described in comment number 234, Wapet Walk to cover the 18 drill holes; Pastoral Walk to infrastructure between Eight Mile Mill and the Herald Bay fence line; Herald Heights to the blowholes; and Surf Point Walk which include spectacular coastal scenery. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. There is a statement in Section 32.5 - <i>Recreation Activities and Use - Bushwalking</i> that other bushwalks may be developed as demand increases and after detailed planning, review of the management setting implications and public consultation. These additional walktrails may be considered in the future if there is a demand for them. | No |
| 42.2 - Dirk Hartog Island - Recreational Use and Activities - Recreational Fishing | | | | |
| 259 | Suggests that more information regarding recreational fishing on Dirk Hartog Island should be included in this section as it is the most requested activity on Dirk Hartog Island for families and small children as well as fishermen. Suggests that the key point should be, "Rock and beach fishing is extremely popular at all times of the year and includes amateurs, families and children", the objective should be, "The objective is to provide opportunities for fishing at appropriate sites around Dirk Hartog Island that are safe, facilitate visitor enjoyment, appreciation and understanding of the key values, whilst minimising environmental impacts." and the strategies should be, "This will be achieved by: consultation with the current users; encouragement of catch and release; encouragement of only keep what you can eat today; location of extra safe locations for children to experience beach fishing and signpost them accordingly." Dirk Hartog Island offers many opportunities for safe beach fishing and camping for children. Herald Bay is one of the safest and most accessible sites. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Recreational fishing across the entire planning area is adequately covered in Section 32.6 - <i>Recreational Fishing</i> . Dirk Hartog Island has been added to strategy 4 in this section so that it now reads, "in consultation with fishers, implementing appropriate strategies to prevent conflict between fishers and other users, especially at Steep Point and on Dirk Hartog Island." | Yes |
| 42.3 - Dirk Hartog Island - Tourism and Commercial Opportunities | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 42.4 - Dirk Hartog Island - Visitor Safety | | | | |
| 260 | Suggests that the statement that there have been deaths from drowning on the western side of Dirk Hartog Island is incorrect and should be removed as there is no knowledge of deaths from rock fishing on Dirk Hartog Island. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. The reference to "deaths from drowning" changed to "serious injuries". | Yes |
| 42.5 - Dirk Hartog Island - Domestic Animals | | | | |
| 261 | Suggests that a reason for keeping domestic animals (including poultry) off islands is the risk of introducing and transferring diseases to native fauna. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or were considered during plan preparation. The risks associated with taking domestic animals into the national parks and nature reserves of the planning area (including the spread of disease) are outlined in Section 35 - <i>Domestic Animals</i> . | No |
| PART F: MANAGING RESOURCE USE | | | | |
| Introduction/General | | | | |
| 262 | Suggests that there are no issues in relation to commercial harvesting of forest produce in the planning area and has no particular comment on the plan. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes general statement and no change is sought. | No |

| 43. Traditional Hunting and Gathering | | | | |
|--|--|-------|--|-----|
| 263 | Acknowledges that the traditional hunting and gathering resources of Aboriginal people will be protected. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 264 | Suggests that DEC engages with the Native Title Claimants in an agreement to manage flora and fauna in a sustainable way with consideration of traditional and current resource use. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details not necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long term. The Department will continue to engage informally with local Indigenous people to enable traditional hunting and gathering. | No |
| 44. Mineral and Petroleum Exploration and Development | | | | |
| 265 | Suggests that the plan makes reference to geothermal energy resources and their renewable energy potential. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Information about geothermal energy added to the plan. | Yes |
| 266 | Refer to exploration licences 09/939-941 that overlap the World Heritage Property and, because of this, have a 'no mining' condition placed on the portions overlapping the WHP. However, suggest that 5 exploration licences (09/942-044 and 09/057), applied for in mid 1998 that lie entirely within the WHP do not have this condition. Suggests a meeting to establish DEC's position on these exploration licences. | | Cheryl to check that these do have a "no mining" clause. | |
| 267 | Advises that, as part of the 2005 Public Environmental Review of Gunson's Coburn mineral sands project, the State and Federal Environment Minister's approved the project subject to the establishment of a 4400 square kilometre conservation offset area. Suggests that this area be included in future management plans for the World Heritage Property. Suggests a meeting with DEC to discuss the mechanism of incorporating this area into the conservation estate. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. The establishment of this "conservation offset area" is still being negotiated and, given that the values of this area are unknown, it will be difficult to add this area to the World Heritage Property. | No |
| 268 | Suggests that the statement, "...applications that were lodged before February 2001 for access to national parks and nature reserves....are considered but there is no assumption for approval.", although legally correct, could create considerable uncertainty for companies which have been granted exploration licences before February 2001, but have not progressed to the mining state. This applies to Gunson Resources Limited who have exploration licences in the proposed Zuytdorp Nature Reserve expansion which were submitted in 1998 and the company has incurred considerable expenditure to date, with one project to be developed as a mine. Suggests that the impact of the plan on these exploration licences is unclear and that the final management plan should be clearer in relation to these licences. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. The statement, "applications that were lodged before February 2001 for access to national parks and nature reserves....are considered but there is no assumption for approval" applies to former State Government policy and therefore has been removed from the plan. Statements regarding the progress of exploration licences to mining projects cannot be made in a management plan. All mining projects proposed on conservation estate need to be referred to the EPA for assessment, which occurs on a case by case basis. | Yes |
| 269 | Suggests that the comment number 268 is given further weight given the long-term proposal to convert the expanded Zuytdorp Nature Reserve into a wilderness area, where all mechanised transport will be prohibited, precluding exploration and mining activities. | 2 (c) | Comment addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. See discussion associated with comment number 268 above. In addition, the final management plan will not propose the gazettal of a wilderness area, but that wilderness values will be protected and the establishment of a wilderness area may be considered when the management plan is reviewed. | No |
| 270 | See comment number 266. | | | |
| 271 | Advises that Gunson has set aside a 4400 hectare conservation offset area as part of its environmental approval for development of the Amy Zone heavy mineral sand deposit immediately east of the World Heritage Property. Suggests this area should be referred to in the management plan. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. See discussion associated with comment number 267. | No |
| 272 | Suggests that the statement that no petroleum exploration has occurred in the planning area is incorrect as Wapet sank 18 exploration wells on Dirk | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. The current text states that there has been none for over 25 years which is correct. | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|---|-----|
| | Hartog Island in the 1950s and now offer opportunities for visitation under controlled access. | | However, text changed to make reference to WAPET drilling. | |
| 273 | Suggests this section provides a comprehensive description of mineral and petroleum issues. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 274 | In the Legislative Framework section on page 210, suggests that the Petroleum Act should be replaced with the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Resources Act 1967. Also in paragraph 2 on page 202, the reference to the Minister for State Development as the "relevant" Minister under the Petroleum Act is incorrect and the Minister for Resources is the relevant Minister. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text changed to include this information. | Yes |
| 275 | Advises that there is no protocol in place between DOIR and DEC with respect to geothermal energy and access to the conservation estate. Consequential amendments were made to the CALM Act. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. The development of a protocol between DOIR and the Department about geothermal energy and access to the conservation estate applies across the State, not only to the planning area. Therefore this requires high level negotiations and the development of a Statewide policy to address this issue. | No |
| 276 | Suggests that paragraph 2 of page 202 need to be changed to recognise that, "[under a 2004 MOU between DOIR and the EPA, [all developmental type mining proposals] all mining proposals within 2km of a national park, marine park, State forest or proposed conservation reserve will be [automatically] referred to the EPA for assessment." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text changed to include this information. | Yes |
| 277 | Supports the position that the cost of rehabilitation associated with mineral or petroleum activities should be borne by the proponent. This is achieved by requiring the proponent to provide a bank guaranteed unconditional performance bond, which ensures that the liability to the State is minimised in the event that mining companies do not fulfil their obligations to rehabilitate mining tenements. For bonds to be relinquished, proponents must rehabilitate to an acceptable standard. The bond policy has been reviewed by DOIR and new bond rates are effective from 1st July 2008. There are also conditions which require the rehabilitation of areas cleared for exploration within 6 months of the disturbance. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details not necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long term. | No |
| 278 | Suggests that the following text be added to the Government Policy section, "Following commencement of the amendment legislation to the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Resources Act 1967, the Department of Industry and Resources completed a release of exploration acreage for geothermal energy resources. DOIR is now assessing applications for exploration permits for geothermal energy. A second release of geothermal energy exploration acreage is planned for later this year on the lands adjacent to the managed area. Subsequent exploration activity will provide increased knowledge of the geothermal energy resource potential of this area." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Information about geothermal energy added to this section of the plan. | Yes |
| 279 | Suggests that the geothermal energy prospectivity of the regions in the proposed tenure change areas has not yet been evaluated and data from land areas to the north and south of the management area indicate possible geothermal energy resources. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Information about geothermal energy potential of the proposed additions added to Section 16 - <i>Geology, Geomorphology and Soils</i> , with a cross-reference in Section 44 - <i>Mineral and Petroleum Exploration and Development</i> . | Yes |
| 280 | Suggests that Figure 5 on page 205 show Petroleum Exploration Permit 401 R1, which is pending renewal and is inconsistent with information contained in Table 22. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Figure 5 updated to show this information. | Yes |
| 281 | Suggests that Figure 5 show the proposed geothermal energy acreage release situated adjacent to the planning area. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides details not necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing management direction over the long term. Given that investigations relating to geothermal acreage are still in their early stages, it is | No |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|--|-----|
| | | | not necessary to include this in Figure 5. | |
| 282 | Suggests that the title of Table 22 be changed to, "Current Mining Tenements and Petroleum Titles/Reserve of the Shark Bay Area." The petroleum title EP406 has a lease area [sic.] of 66 Blocks and this information should be included in the table. The heading of the column should be changed to "Tenement/Title Area" | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Table 22 updated to show this information. | Yes |
| 283 | Suggests that "geothermal energy" should be added to the last key point on page 207 and an extra bullet point be added stating, "The exploration and development of renewable Hot Rock and conventional geothermal energy resources within or adjacent to the management area has the potential to generate base load energy." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Key point modified to show this information. | Yes |
| 284 | Suggests the addition of the words "geothermal energy" to the objective. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Text modified to reflect this information. | Yes |
| 285 | Suggests the addition of geothermal energy to strategies 1 and 4. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Text modified to reflect this information. | Yes |
| 286 | Suggests that the statement, "An exploration licence has been issued to Gunson Resources for an area on Coburn Station which adjoins the World Heritage Property and the planning area." is incorrect and that Gunson's has three granted exploration licences on Coburn and Hamelin station and one exploration licence application on Hamelin Station. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Text modified to reflect this information. | Yes |
| 287 | Suggests that the statement, "The area of the initial exploration licence included parts of the World Heritage Property but was modified to align with the boundary of the Property." is incorrect. Suggests that Gunson's did relinquish overlapping portions of EL09/996 but this licence expired and has been replaced by ELA09/1503 on Hamelin Station. Overlapping areas of the remaining three licences 09/939-941 have not been relinquished but do not have a "no mining (exploration)" condition on the portions that overlap the World Heritage Property. Suggests that the fourth sentence of the paragraph should be removed and replaced by the last sentence of the same paragraph. This last sentence is currently out of place as it suggests that the other pending exploration licence applications mentioned in the second last sentence have a 'no mining' condition. The pending exploration licences have no conditions on them as they have not been granted. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Text modified to reflect this information. | Yes |
| 288 | Suggests that an extra paragraph of the 'no mining' condition should be included. The Department of Minerals and Energy information circular (17 June 1998) explained that 'no mining' conditions were placed on tenements that had less than 50% overlap on reserved land. This was adopted to facilitate the earlier grant of title over the portion of the tenement that did not encroach on reserved land, while responsible ministers resolved access to the reserved portion. The tenement holder could apply for authority to access the served land under the Mining Act which may result in the 'no mining' condition being waived. Suggests it should not be implied that a 'no mining' condition is permanent. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Text modified to reflect this information. | Yes |
| 289 | Suggests that Figure 5 is out of date. Gunson's granted EL 09/940 should be added and EL 09/996 expired in mid 2007 and was replaced in late 2007 by EL 09/1503. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Figure 5 modified to reflect this information. | Yes |
| 290 | Suggests that Table 22 is incomplete and out of date for the reasons raised in comment number 289. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omission, inaccuracy or a lack of clarity. Table 22 modified to reflect this information. | Yes |

| 45. Basic Raw Materials | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------|---|-----|
| 291 | Concerned about the statement that a 2005 Main Roads report recommends the, " <i>establishment of a single, large extraction gravel pit in the Tamala area for economic and environmental reasons</i> ". Suggests that this statement is misleading and does not take into account the long-term BRM needs of Main Roads and the Shire of Shark Bay. Suggests that the plan should refer to a number of additional reports, these being Useless Loop (2005) report, a materials investigation of pits for the Useless Loop Road (2005 and the Ham-Den Base Pits report outlining pits along the Shark Bay Road recommended for future investigation. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Additional information about these reports added to the plan. | Yes |
| 292 | Suggests that maintenance of the Shark Bay and Monkey Mia Roads requires basic raw material that is less abrasive but high strength in wet weather, with cementing/limestone based material for bonding when used on shoulders. Maintenance of the Useless Loop Road requires medium to high plastic sand/clay gravelly limestone material. In the long-term, it is proposed this road will be sealed, which will require high strength BRM. Existing material in the area is low strength, so strategies to locate high strength material is required. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment is beyond the scope of the plan. This information is too detailed for inclusion in the plan | No |
| 293 | Main Roads long term (20-30 year) strategy for the Gascoyne Region is to locate potential gravel reserves and work with relevant agencies to ensure the sustainability of BRM and to provide for projected growth in tourism and mining etc. Therefore a long-term strategy is required to meet the future maintenance demands on roads, including the Useless Loop, Shark Bay and Monkey Mia Roads. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Additional information added to the plan. | Yes |
| 294 | Suggests that four quarry reserves located along the Shark Bay Road will be required to meet the demands of future construction and maintenance of the Shark Bay and Monkey Mia Roads. These have been identified by Main Roads and recommended as reserves to DPI, subject to testing for material suitability properties. Four quarry reserves have been identified along the Useless Loop Road, for the maintenance of this road, although no recommendation for reservation has occurred as yet. Suggests that Main Roads and the Shire of Shark Bay's strategy is to identify a variety of BRM sources to maintain this road in the short term and upgrade it to a sealed road in the future | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Additional information added to the plan. | Yes |
| 295 | Suggests that the recommendations in the draft plan in relation to BRM will increase the cost of transportation of materials and is untenable in its current form. In addition, materials within the planning area are not suitable for all engineering requirements. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Section revised to included additional detail about BRM requirements in the planning area. | Yes |
| 296 | Suggests that the sentence, "Extraction from reserves in the planning area by Local Government Authorities for use on road reserve enclaves within conservation estate in the planning area occurs under the LG Act and a CALM lease is required," be changed to "...occurs under the LG Act with DEC approval." CALM leases are no longer available for BRM removal. | 1 (c) | Noted. Comment clarifies Government legislation, management commitment or management policy. Text revised to reflect this. | Yes |
| 297 | Suggests that the sentence, "Approval is required by the Minister for Lands, the Minister for the Environment or the Conservation Commission." is removed as approval by the Minister for Lands, the Minister for the Environment is not required. | 1 (c) | Noted. Comment clarifies Government legislation, management commitment or management policy. Text revised to reflect this. | Yes |
| 298 | Advises that class A Conservation Parks outside the south west do not | 1 (c) | Noted. Comment clarifies Government legislation, management commitment or | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|---|-----|
| | require parliamentary approval for mining. Suggests that the final sentence of paragraph 3, page 208 is modified to reflect this. | | management policy. Text revised to reflect this. | |
| 299 | Advises that transport distances of a maximum of 10-15km for BRM transport is preferred. Suggests that the proposal to use a centrally located BRM pit on Tamala would be economically unviable as transport distances for BRM could be up to 150km, depending on road work requirements. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text changed to remove reference to centrally located pit on Tamala. | Yes |
| 300 | Advises of four existing BRM sites on the Monkey Mia reserve, which have been exhausted, several old and existing sites in the South Peron area, adjacent to the Shark Bay Road (including Shire Reserve 44988), several old and existing sites adjacent to the Useless Loop Road, some small limestone quarries on Dirk Hartog Island and Edel Land and some birridas located on the northern part of Peron Peninsula, Nanga, Edel Land and Dirk Hartog Island (although the Shire acknowledges that the use of birridas as a source of BRM will only be as a last resort and when there are no alternative sources of BRM). | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text changed to refer to these reserves of basic raw materials. These reserves will require surveying and vesting to ensure they are not included in the proposed conservation estate when the reserves are created. | Yes |
| 301 | Acknowledges that the use of BRM from the planning area will be subject to standard Department and Government approvals processes. | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes general statement and no change is sought. | No |
| 302 | Supports the use of exiting BRM pits, which still contains useable materials and the identification of further sites in conjunction with the Shire of Shark Bay and Main Roads WA. Suggests that the plan identifies present and future BRM sites, in accordance with the Material Assessment Report (Main Roads WA, 2005) to accurately identify and register current and future BRM sites. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. See discussion associated with comment number 300. | Yes |
| 303 | Suggests there are no limestone quarries on Dirk Hartog Island which have been used for road construction. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Reference to limestone quarries being used for road construction on Dirk Hartog Island removed. | Yes |
| 304 | Concerned about the recommendation about the establishment of a single large extraction gravel pit in the Tamala area to provide roadbase material to service the peninsula. This would be problematic due to the long distances required to transport the material and the requirement for a range of materials which could not be extract from a single source. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text changed to remove reference to centrally located pit on Tamala. | Yes |
| 305 | Acknowledges that the Shark Bay World Heritage Property Strategic Plan states that basic raw materials are required for road construction and maintenance in the future and that demand for access in the World Heritage Property will also increase in the future. Advises that this is recognised in the Roads 2020 Regional Roads Development Strategy (MRWA 1997) and the Roads 2025 Strategy (2007). | 2 (b) | Noted. Comment makes general statement and no change is sought. | No |
| 306 | Acknowledges that the Shark Bay World Heritage Property Strategic Plan states that the requirement to identify sources of basic raw material and to establish appropriate management and controls for extraction. Supports inter-agency consultation and the development of a basic raw materials plan and a rehabilitation plan. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |
| 307 | Advises of the need to ensure that suitable raw material reserves are available and reserved to maintain the existing road network and provide for new road infrastructure in the future. Particular raw materials are required for maintenance activities. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. | Yes |
| 308 | Advises that the Shark Bay and Monkey Mia roads will require widening to cater for increased growth and will provide additional safety benefits. Over the period 2005-2008 there has been a 25% increase in traffic volumes on | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text changed to include this information. | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------|---|-----|
| | the Shark Bay Road. Basic raw materials will be required for such works. | | | |
| 309 | Main roads in the Shark Bay area were extensively damaged by above average rainfall in March-April 2008. Damage was repaired quickly to ensure the safety of all road users. Such events need to be responded to in a timely manner and the availability of strategically located road building materials is essential. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text changed to include this information. | Yes |
| 310 | Suggests that three quarry reserves located along the Shark Bay Road will be required to meet the demands of future construction and maintenance of the Shark Bay and Monkey Mia Roads. Three quarry reserves have been identified along the Useless Loop Road, for the maintenance of this road, although no recommendation for reservation has occurred as yet. Desktop studies of these reserves have been completed and Main Roads will be submitting these areas as gravel reserves. Advises that these proposed gravel reserves will have considerably less impact than the numerous sites identified in previous studies. Once exhausted, a rehabilitation plan will be implemented. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text changed to refer to these reserves of basic raw materials. These reserves will require surveying and vesting to excise them from the conservation estate. | Yes |
| 311 | Advises that Main Roads has developed a Sustainability Policy to ensure that the roads system is managed, operated and developed without compromise and strong relationships are developed with the community and partner agencies. | 2 (h) | Noted. Comment provides information not appropriate or necessary for inclusion. | No |
| 312 | Suggests that there is no mention of the need for construction materials by the residents of the townships. A supply may be required for future developments. Mineral sourced on Crown land, which includes pastoral leases, would require the granting of a mining lease. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Construction materials for Denham residents will be extracted from the proposed reserves of basic raw materials identified in comment number 300 and 310. | Yes |
| 313 | Suggests the last sentence of paragraph 3, page 208 be changed to, "[extraction of BRM on UCL occurs under the LG Act of the Mining Act." as all mineral exploration and mining activities in Western Australia are subject to the provisions of the Mining Act. BRM extraction on private land is authorised by Local Government through the granting of extractive industry licences. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text changed to include this information. | Yes |
| 314 | Suggests that the plan provide greater direction and clarity in relation to BRM and that further negotiations regarding access to and provision for the extraction of BRM. Supports access to basic raw materials by local government and developers and suggests that Crown reserves 41076, 44988 and 37963 (shown in Table 22) be shown in Figure 5 as it is not clear whether these areas are in the conservation estate. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. This section has been rewritten to provide greater clarity on the issue. Detail about reserves 41076 and 44988 is provided in Section 12 - Existing and Proposed Tenure and their locations are shown on Map 2. Information about Reserve 37962 added to Section 12 and its location added to Map 2. | Yes |
| 315 | Given the presumption against accessing BRM in the conservation estate, suggests that the plan is clear where BRM in the Shark Bay area and that access to them is not too restrictive and that the plan recognises the need to undertake infrastructure works and future construction works as required. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. This section has been rewritten to provide greater clarity on the issue. The intent of the plan is not to be overly restrictive regarding access to BRM. | Yes |
| 46. Rehabilitation | | | | |
| 316 | Suggests that the sentence on page 210 be changed to "land should be managed as far as possible to avoid minimise disturbance." to maintain consistency with other Acts and policy in relation to rehabilitation. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Text changed to include this information. | Yes |
| 317 | Suggests that the statement, "...rehabilitation should be the last option in a series of management decisions designed to protect the natural values." is unclear and that it has been interpreted to mean that rehabilitation should not be used as a justification for not taking due care to minimise | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. This statement is drawn direct from DEC's Policy Statement 10 - <i>Rehabilitation of Disturbed Land</i> (CALM 1996) and this needs to be reflected in the text. In this policy, the statement is made that other policies deal with this principle in more | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------|--|----|
| | environmental damage during the development of a project. Suggests this be rewritten to clarify, along the lines of "Although rehabilitation should be the last option in a series of management decisions designed to protect natural values, it should be one of the first considerations if disturbance cannot be avoided." | | detail. However, the additional suggested text added to this point in brackets." | |
| 318 | Suggests that the following points regarding rehabilitation be added to the text: a) Effective rehabilitation requires baseline understanding of the biological values of the ecosystem. Without this, it is difficult to quantify the success of rehabilitation. A flora survey of the area proposed to be disturbed is an essential component of this baseline analysis and will assist in the development of completion criteria; b) planting density for rehabilitation should consider the potential for high mortality as conditions are often less favourable for plan establishment; c) completion criteria should be established to monitor rehabilitation (refer to the EPA Guidance Statement No 6 - Rehabilitation of Terrestrial Ecosystems"; and d) regular monitoring is critical successful rehabilitation to evaluate whether completion criteria have been successfully met. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. This information is too detailed for inclusion in a management plan. | No |
| 47. Commercial Fishing | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 48. Water Extraction | | | | |
| 319 | Concerned about access to current water bores within the planning area (for joint or singular use) for road building and future artesian water bores. | 2 (c) | Noted. Comments makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. This section provides for access to water for road building and fire management by parties other than DEC. | No |
| 320 | Suggests that current water bore/extraction licences held by DEC are transferred to the Shire of Shark Bay or identified as joint use by both the Shire of Shark Bay and DEC (for fire management purposes). | 2 (c) | Comments makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. Table 23 outlines which bores are to be decommissioned and which are to be considered for the transfer of the Water Removal Permit to the LGA. Two bores are identified to be retained by the Department (Peron No. 3 - Eagle Bluff and Nanga No. 2 - Homestead). | No |
| 321 | Suggests the identification of future bore sites for future water extraction. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan. Establishment of future bores requires the approval of Department of Water and the land manager. | No |
| 49. Pollution and Waste Management | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 50. Defence, Emergency and Other Training | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| 51. Public Utilities and Services | | | | |
| 322 | Suggests that staff accommodation, workshop facilities and ranger station be assessed for environmental, social and economic criteria and be located at the homestead where synergies and economies could be achieved. | 2 (e) | Noted. Comment is one of several divergent viewpoints and the strategies of the plan are still considered the best option. See discussion associated with comment number 227. | No |
| 323 | Acknowledges the objective, "protect the key values and the planning area through minimising the environmental impacts of siting and constructing utilities and services." and that maintenance of and expansion of water and wastewater services will need to be carried out with due regard for key values. | 2 (a) | Noted. Comment supports the plan. | No |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------|---|-----|
| 52. Scientific and Research Use | | | | |
| No comments were received on this section. | | | | |
| PART G: INVOLVING THE COMMUNITY | | | | |
| 53. Community Education and Interpretation | | | | |
| No comments were received on this section. | | | | |
| 54. Community Involvement and Volunteers | | | | |
| No comments were received on this section. | | | | |
| PART H: MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN | | | | |
| 55. Administration | | | | |
| 324 | Suggests that the operational centre on Dirk Hartog Island be located at the homestead where joint synergies could be achieved in relation to logistics, power and water. The current lessees would be prepared to provide accommodation, facilities and access. | 2 (e) | Noted. Comment is one of several divergent viewpoints and the strategies of the plan are still considered the best option. See discussion associated with comment number 227. | No |
| 325 | Suggests the need for a committee to review and assist in the implementation of the management plan. Suggests that the current pastoral lessees on Dirk Hartog Island could offer much as a member of such a committee as one of the major stakeholders in the success of the national park management plan, with over forty years experience on Dirk Hartog Island and the infrastructure in place. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. The World Heritage Property Community Consultative Committee (or a revision thereof) may be involved in the implementation of the management plan and this is discussed in Section 55 - <i>Administration</i> . As positions become available on this committee, they will be widely advertised and the submitter will be able to apply. | No |
| 326 | Suggests that there is strong representation and involvement from the recreational fishing sector on any management committee involved with implementing the management plan and the detail not provided in the plan, given this sector is and will continue to be a major user of the area. | 2 (d) | Noted. Comment makes statements already in the plan or considered during plan preparation. See discussion associated with comment number 325 above. | No |
| 56. Research and Monitoring | | | | |
| No comments were received on this section. | | | | |
| 57. Term of the Plan | | | | |
| No comments were received on this section. | | | | |
| GLOSSARY, ACRONYMS, REFERENCES AND PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS | | | | |
| 327 | The reference, "Australia ICOMOS 2000 The Burra Charter: the Australia ICOMOS charter for places of cultural significance, Australia ICOMOS Incorporated." should read, "Australia ICOMOS 1999 The Burra Charter: the Australia ICOMOS charter for the conservation of places of cultural significance, Australia ICOMOS Incorporated." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Reference corrected. | Yes |
| APPENDICES | | | | |
| Appendix 5 - Weed species within the planning area | | | | |
| 328 | Questions why <i>Bromus</i> sp. is included in the list? | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Reference to this species deleted. | Yes |
| 329 | Suggests that the common name for <i>Eragrostis barrelieri</i> is pitted | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table | Yes |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

| | | | | |
|-------------------|---|-------|---|-----|
| | lovegrass. | | corrected. | |
| 230 | Suggests that "Common stoksbill" should be "Common storksbill." | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 331 | Suggests that the common name for <i>Orobanche</i> spp is Broomrape. All <i>Orobanche</i> spp are declared except for <i>Orobanche minor</i> and <i>O. cernua</i> var. <i>australis</i> . <i>O. ramosa</i> is only known to be in SA where is subject to eradication. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 332 | Suggests that <i>Pseudognaphalium</i> is deleted. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 333 | Suggests that the common name for <i>Rostraria cristata</i> is annual cat's tail. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 334 | Suggests that the common name for <i>Rostraria pumila</i> is rough cat's tail. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 335 | Suggests that the common name for <i>Spergularia rubra</i> is red sand spurrey. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 336 | Suggests that the reference to tamarisk be removed as this is the common name for a different species of tamarix and could be confusing. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 337 | Suggests that the common name for <i>Nicotiana glauca</i> is tree tobacco. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 338 | Suggests that the common name for <i>Bromus japonicus</i> is Japanese brome. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 339 | Suggests that the common name for <i>Cerastium glomeratum</i> is sticky mouse-eared chickweed. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 340 | Suggests that the common name for <i>Citrullus lanatus</i> is Afghan melon or pie melon. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 314 | Suggests that <i>Champia parvula</i> is listed as a native in Florabase. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 342 | Suggests that the common name for <i>Cuscuta planiflora</i> is small-seeded dodder. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 343 | Suggests that the common name for <i>Hornungia procumbens</i> is oval purse. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 344 | Suggests that <i>Tribolus terrestris</i> should be <i>Tribulus terrestris</i> . | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| 345 | Suggests that <i>Argemone ochroleuca</i> (Mexican poppy) was listed in the issues paper (and is shown in Florabase) as occurring in the planning area but does not occur on the list. | 1 (e) | Noted. Comment indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity. Table corrected. | Yes |
| MAPS | | | | |
| | No comments were received on this section. | | | |
| REFERENCES | | | | |
| | Weldon, C., du Preez, L.H., Hyatt, A.D., Muller, R. and Speare, R (2004) Origin of the amphibian chytrid fungus. Emerging Infectious Diseases.10 (12): 2100-2105. | | | |

Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserve and Proposed Reserve Additions Draft Management Plan 2007 – Analysis of Public Submissions

Appendix 1

| Title | First Name | Last Name | Title |
|--------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| Mr | Peter | Sewell | Regional Manager |
| Dr | Colleen | Sims | Project Officer - Project Eden |
| Ms | Jenni | Williams | A/Manager Assessments and Registration |
| Mr | John | Taylor | |
| Dr | Ian | Abbott | Senior Principal Research Scientist |
| Mr | D.N | Harley | Managing Director |
| Mr | Ross | Anderson | |
| Mr | Ian | Stagles | Secretary |
| Mr | Richard | Dudley | General Manager - Corporate Affairs |
| Mr | Norm | Caporn | Branch Manager - Environmental Management Branch |
| Ms | Diana | Jones | Acting Chief Executive Officer |
| Ms | Neroli | Needham | |
| Mr | Barry | Oakman | President |
| Mr | Gary | Wotherspoon | |
| Mr | Kelvin | Matthews | Chief Executive Officer |
| Mr | Cameron | Finnie | |
| Dr | Nicky | Marlow | Chair, Shark Bay Marsupials Recovery Team |
| Mr | Charles | Briser | Director, Strategic Approvals and Legislation Branch |
| Dr | Justin | Walawski | Chief Executive |
| Mr | Mark | Smith | |
| Mr | Scott | Coglan | Editor and Director |
| Mr | Marcus | Keizer | |
| Ms | Tessa | Herrmann | Legal Officer |
| Mr | Alex | Burbury | Policy Director - Pastoral and Livestock |
| Mr | Geoff | Wardle | |
| Mr | Pat | Shinnick | President |
| Ms | Renata | Low | A/Executive Director - Industry Development |
| Mr | Peter | Sewell | Regional Manager |
| Ms | Anne | Nolan | Director General |
| Mr | Paul | Ferguson | General Manager - Business Services Division |
| Mr | Ron | Alexander | Director General |
| Mr | D.N | Harley | Managing Director |
| Mr | Eric | Lumsden | Director General |
| Ms | Kellie | Agar | Program Coordinator, Invasive Plants |
| Mr | Ian | Rotheram | Acting Manager Policy and Extension |
| Ms | Sally | McGann | Senior Heritage Officer |
| Mr | Les | George | |
| Mr | Anthony | Desmond | Regional Leader Nature Conservation |
| Mr | Nick | Underwood | Chairman |
| Ms | Lucy | Karger | |
| Mr | Andrew | Maclea | Executive Director |
| Mr | Greg | Young | Senior Legal Officer |