Fitzgerald River National Park

Analysis of Public Submissions

MANAGEMENT PLAN No 15

Department of Conservation and Land Management

FITZGERALD RIVER NATIONAL PARK MANAGEMENT PLAN

ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

TO THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Compiled by Matthew Cavana

Department of Conservation and Land Management
for the
National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority
Perth, Western Australia, 1991

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This document is an analysis of submissions to the draft management plan for Fitzgerald River National Park (1989).

During the preparation of the draft plan, CALM, on behalf of the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority, sought the participation of the general public and interested parties via the Fitzgerald River National Park Advisory Committee, field visits, workshops and visitor surveys. The Fitzgerald River National Park Advisory Committee took a lead role in preparation of the draft management plan (DMP). Meetings were held with local communities, conservation groups and Government agencies, including local government.

The DMP was released for public comment on 7 June 1989, by the then Minister for Conservation and Land Management, the Hon. Ian Taylor MLA, at a public meeting held at Fitzgerald Hall, Fitzgerald. The plan was circulated for public comment to all individuals and organisations who expressed interest during preparation of the draft. It was also distributed to State Government departments, tertiary institutions, conservation groups, recreation groups and local authorities. The plan was available in libraries and was for sale from several outlets. The availability of the plan was promoted in both local and Statewide newspapers and a number of meetings were held in the local community to discuss the DMP and to assist people in making submissions.

The DMP was available for public comment, in accordance with the CALM Act (1984), until 7 September, 1989. This was extended until 13 October, 1989, to accommodate the number of respondents who felt that the depth and scope of the report required extra time to collate a submission. A total of 178 submissions were received.

In December 1989, a series of lightning fires burnt over 150 000 ha of the Park and a review of the fire management plan was necessary. All submittors to the DMP were encouraged to submit further comments regarding the fire management plan. Furthermore, a Fire Working Group was convened comprising the Chief Fire Control Officers of both the Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe Shires, the Bush Fires Board and CALM Operations staff. The Working Group's proposal for fire management in the Park was reviewed by CALM in relation to dieback disease, fire management, wilderness and recreation access. Both proposals have been considered as submissions to the DMP. A total of 16 submissions were received post-fire.

All comments have been analysed in this document. Changes have been made to the DMP according to set criteria described below.

Method of Analysis

Public submissions to Fitzgerald River National Park draft management plan were reviewed as follows:

- All comments were collated according to the section of the DMP they addressed.
- Each comment was assessed using the following criteria:
  1. Changes *were* made to the DMP if a submission:
     a) provided additional information on the physical, biological, geographical or cultural resources of direct relevance to management;
     b) provided additional information on affected user groups, or on social or economic resources of direct relevance to management;
     c) clarified or indicated a change in Government legislation, management commitment, or management policy;
     d) proposed improved, additional or deletion of prescriptions that would help to achieve the management goal(s) and objective(s); or
     e) indicated omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity in the existing text or prescriptions.

  2. Changes were *not* made to the DMP if a submission:
     a) clearly supported the draft recommendation, or no change was sought;
     b) addressed issues beyond the scope of the plan;
     c) points made were already in the plan or had already been considered in plan preparation;
     d) indicated strongly polarised views, with the prescriptions providing the preferred management option.

- The reasons the recommendations of the draft plan were, or were not, changed and the criteria used were addressed with each comment.
- 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 which would give cause to elevate the importance of any submission above another.

Throughout this document, the 'Comment Number' is used as a reference number only. The 'No. of Subs' column refers to the number of submittors who made the particular comment. Amendments to the draft management plan are referenced to the corresponding page(s) in the final plan, and are indicated in the 'Plan Amended' column.

Number and Origin of Submissions

A total of 178 submissions were received:

Community - Individuals	123	69 %
Community - Clubs and Organisations ...	29	16 %
Government departments	13	7 %
CALM Staff	8	4 %
Local Authorities	3	2 %
Fire Working Group (post fire)	1	1 %
CALM Working Group (post fire)	1	1 %
TOTAL	178	

The majority of which were substantial submissions:

Substantial	162	91 %
Proforma Type I	5	3 %
Proforma Type II	5	3 %
Proforma Type III	6	3 %
TOTAL	178	

The origins of submissions were:

Shire of Ravensthorpe	63	35 %
Perth Metropolitan	43	24 %
Shire of Albany	27	15 %
Shire of Jerramungup	21	12 %
Other W.A	21	12 %
Combination of origins	2	1 %
Interstate	1	1 %
TOTAL	178	

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	PREFACE				
	1 submission				
1	Not all national parks and nature reserves in W.A. are vested in the NPNCA.	1	Yes, p. ii	Reword appropriately.	1(e)
	SUMMARY				
	4 submissions				
1	Editorial changes recommended.	2	Yes, p. iv	Editorial changes made if appropriate.	1(e)
2	Should investigate having both day use and camping at Pt Ann, Mylies and Quoin Head.	1	No	No change unless change made in main body of plan.	2(d)
3	Management recommendations not compatible with retention of public access to most of the Park.	1	Yes, p. vii	Clarify availability of public access in Park.	1(e)
	PART A. INTRODUCTION				
	1.0 BACKGROUND				
	1.1 Park Overview				
	1 submission.				
1	The definition of a national park should be included to avoid confusion later in the plan.	1	Yes, p. 3	Add information for clarity.	1(e)
	1.2 Regional Context				
	1 submission.				
1	Should include reference to Draft South Coast Regional Plan (1989).	1	Yes, p. 3	Add information for clarity.	1(e)
2	Include a rider that names on maps are not necessarily officially accepted nomenclature.	1	Yes, p. 3	Add information for clarity.	1(e)
	1.3 CALM Management Policies				
	1 submission.				
1	Include primary recreation objectives upon which CALM policies are based.	1	No	Covered in 2.0 Management Goals.	2(c)
	1.4 Public Participation				
	11 submissions.				
1	Visitor survey does not give true indication of the number of local residents using the Park.	10	Yes, p. 7	Add qualifying statement re. visitor survey.	1(a,b)
2	Local people do not consider themselves as visitors to the Park.	8	Yes, p. 7	Add qualifying statement re. visitor survey.	1(a,b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
3	The public participation process was less than satisfactory and failed to fulfill the extensive consultation so claimed in the DMP.	3	Yes, p. 7	Clarify level of consultation.	1(b,e)
4	The current planning process should be reviewed by a person skilled in sociology.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
	PART B. PRINCIPAL MANAGEMENT DIRECTIONS				
	2.0 MANAGEMENT GOALS				
	9 submissions.				
1	Support all comments in this section.	7	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	An increase in staffing and financial resources is needed to achieve goals.	2	No	Covered in 19.0 Staff and 21.0 Funding.	2(c)
3	Editorial changes suggested.	2	Yes, p. 11	Editorial changes made if appropriate.	1(e)
4	Conservation, research and monitoring goals should take precedence over other goals.	1	No	This is already the case.	2(a)
5	There is conflict between goals and recommendations (re. access).	1	No	Goals give overall direction to individual recommendations.	2(d)
	3.0 LAND TENURE				
	3.1 National Park Boundaries				
	21 submissions.				
1	Oppose any increase in size of the Park.	5	No	Rationalisation of boundaries will lead to more effective management.	2(b,d)
2	Western boundary should be extended to west bank of Gairdner River.	5	No	Addressed in South Coast Regional Plan (in prep.)	2(b)
3	It is not stated what type of reserve is proposed for Dillon Bay portion.	4	No	These are matters for the Dept of Land Administration to address.	2(c)
4	Reserve 2524 should remain vested in WAWA.	3	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
5	Neatness of boundaries is not valid reason to excise an area. e.g. Dillon Bay	2	No	See Comment 1, this section.	2(a,c)
6	Reserve 5055 should remain vested in WAWA.	2	No	Reserve is currently unvested.	2(c)
7	Southern boundary should be the north bank of the Gairdner River.	2	No	See Comment 2, this section.	2(b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
8	The following areas should be classified as 5g lands: VCL east of Gairdner River (ref J20 in South Coast Regional Plan) VCL east of Gairdner River (ref J22 in South Coast Regional Plan) Reserve 5051 (ref J21 in South Coast Regional Plan) Portion of Reserve 33258 Corridor area between FRNP and Lake Magenta Nature Reserve	2	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
9	Should physically separate Park into Res. 31737 and 31738.	1	No	Both areas are national park as described under the CALM Act.	2(b)
10	Need to define Hunter River catchment boundary; excised area I.D. No. 8 should be added to Res. 2524.	1	No	To be addressed by Dept of Land Administration.	2(b)
11	There is a possible water pipeline route between Bremer Bay and the Hunter River Reserve and/or Tooregullup Swamp Reserve; this pipeline would traverse 3 of the reserves for which changes are proposed (ID No's 4, 6, 9).	1	No	Provisions for a pipeline can be met within existing policies.	2(c)
12	Propose that 'water' be added to purpose of Jerramungup Shire reserve.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
	3.2 Shire Reserves *10 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	3	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Support compatible management between Shire reserves and FRNP.	3	No	No change sought.	2(a,b)
3	Seek to have status of Hamersley Inlet reserve changed to National Park.	2	No	Requires consensus between CALM and Shire of Ravensthorpe.	2(c,d)
4	Seek to have purpose of Hamersley Inlet reserve amended to include 'cons. of flora'.	2	No	See Comment 3, this section.	2(c,d)
5	Shire council will adhere to management plan for Hamersley Inlet reserve wherever possible.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	3.3 Other Crown Land Within the National Park Boundary *16 submissions.*				
1	Support establishment of inlets as marine parks.	7	Yes, p. 15	Marine reserves are being addressed on a State-wide priority basis and the south coast has not yet been investigated. Add to FMP.	1(e)
2	Support for recommendations.	5	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Support establishment of a marine park along the coast of Park.	3	Yes, p. 15	See Comment 1, this section.	1(e)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	CHANGE REC	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
4	Support proposal for Bremer River area.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
5	Opposed to Gordon Inlet becoming marine park. Management of commercial fishing should remain with Fisheries Dept.	1	No	Commercial fishing in marine parks is jointly managed by Fisheries Department and CALM.	2(b)
6	Support cancellation of unused road reserves.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
7	Should include Southern Ocean West Road in Table 2.	1	No	Action has already been taken.	2(c)
	3.4 Private Property Enclaves in the National Park *5 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	3	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Biosphere concept should prevail in Quaalup area.	1	No	Quaalup is within the IBR buffer area and zone of co-operation.	2(c)
3	Should purchase uncleared, alienated land along rivers.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
	3.5 Crown Land Adjacent to the National Park *8 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	This land should be added to the Park wherever possible.	3	No	Complementary management will enhance Park values.	2(c)
3	Advisory Committee should continue to exist to advise and assist in implementing compatible management practises among the various land managers.	1	No	Refer to 20.1 Community Liaison.	2(c)
4	All VCL and 5g reserves adjacent to the Park should be classified as A class reserves for multiple-use to comply with IBR concept.	1	No	All tenure changes are being further reviewed in the South Coast Region Regional Plan (CALM, in prep).	2(b)
5	Opposed to change in vesting of all VCL bounded by Cocanarup Rd, H'toun-Ravensthorpe Rd and northern boundary of Park.	1	No	See Comment 4, this section.	2(b)
	4.0 INTERNATIONAL BIOSPHERE RESERVE *14 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	9	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	CALM should formalise links with FRNPA.	4	No	Discussed in Section 20.1 Community Liaison	2(c)
3	CALM should formalise links with J'mungup and R'thorpe Soil Cons. Groups	1	No	Discussed in Section 20.1 Community Liaison	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
4	Government should show good faith by active involvement in and resourcing of the FBR.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
5	Plan would benefit by delineating zone of co-operation: it would be strategic to base such a zone on hydrologic boundaries.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
6	Core and buffer areas should be nominated within the Park.	1	No	This would not satisfy the IBR definition.	2(b)
7	IBR status deserves more attention in plan as it gives vital link to the various land managers adjacent to it.	1	No	Interaction between the Park and its surrounds is recognised.	2(c)
8	Suggested rewording Recommendations 3 and 4.	1	Yes, p. 19	Editorial changes made if appropriate.	1(e)
	5.0 MANAGEMENT ZONES *39 submissions.*				
1	Commend the establishment of the wilderness zone.	14	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Support the zoning concept.	10	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Wilderness zone should be to the north of Telegraph track.	8	No	Needs to include section of coastline to satisfy IBR definition.	2(b)
4	Wilderness zone should be closed to any use other than bushwalking.	5	No	Control of bushwalking may need to be altered from time to time depending on dieback.	2(d)
5	Zone boundaries should be flexible and delineated by natural features.	4	No	This is already the case.	2(a)
6	Wilderness zone is not compromised by allowing access to McGlinns.	3	No	Foot access will generally be permitted to McGlinns.	2(c)
7	Bushwalkers should have access to fringe of Wilderness zone only.	2	No	See Comment 4, this section.	2(c, d)
8	Natural environment zone should state 4WD access is restricted rather than 'not preferred'.	2	Yes, p. 22	Reword appropriately.	1(e)
9	Possible to implement multiple land use regime with correct arrangement of zones.	1	No	Contradicts departmental policies.	2(b)
10	CALM needs to develop policies that identify and protect wilderness areas.	1	No	The NPNCA is in the process of developing policies on wilderness.	2(c)
11	Zoning needs to be reconsidered as plan has not taken into account acceptable fire control management plan for the community.	1	No	The fire management plan has been revised (see 9.2 Fire).	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
12	Wilderness, special protection and natural environment zones should be closed to public until effective methods of dieback control are known.	1	No	Refer to 9.1 Disease.	2(c)
13	Area to be added to J'mungup Shire reserve should be zoned 'recreation'; Area to be excised within Hunter River catchment should be 'natural environ'.	1	No	Zoning system applies only to the National Park.	2(c)
14	The core area (wilderness and special conservation zones) is too small.	1	No	Refer to 4.0 International Biosphere Reserve.	2(d)
15	Disagree with wilderness zone concept.	1	No	Aim of zoning is to protect and enhance conservation values while allowing for recreation use.	2(c,d)
	PART C. MANAGEMENT FOR CONSERVATION				
	6.0 PHYSICAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT				
	6.1 Geology				
	6 submissions.				
1	Support for recommendations..	3	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	There is no mention of the greenstone area around the junction of Phillips and West Rivers.	1	Yes, p. 25	Add geological information.	1(a)
3	The term 'gorge' should be replaced with 'incised valley'.	1	Yes, p. 25	Editorial change if appropriate.	1(e)
4	There is a Pleistocene - Holocene shell bed of considerable interest near the east side of Hamersley Inlet.	1	Yes, p. 25	Add geological information.	1(a)
	6.2 Landforms, Soils and Erosion Hazard				
	4 submissions.				
1	Support for recommendations.	3	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Erosion hazard is overstated with no area rated below moderate.	1	No	Erosion hazard was considered in a regional perspective.	2(c)
	6.3 Hydrology				
	12 submissions.				
1	Support all objectives and recommendations.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Boundaries of Dempster catchment need to be double-checked.	4	Yes, Map 5	Editorial change to ensure boundary agrees with map contours.	1(a)
3	Relevant hydrologic studies would require, as a minimum, a gauging station on the Fitzgerald, at or near the existing, and one on either the Dempster or St Mary's Rivers.	2	Yes, p. 31	Add information to text.	1(a)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
4	Regular water sampling, records of water levels, and the opening and closing of bars would be valuable as the basis for inlet management.	1	No	This is already recognised.	2(a,c)
5	Suggest adding 'the reviewing of the suitability of septic tanks on flood prone river flats as in enclaves' to objectives.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan. Referred to Fitzgerald Biosphere Project.	2(b)
6	Suggest fencing of river verges to prevent stock grazing on river beds.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan. Referred to Fitzgerald Biosphere Project.	2(b)
7	Suggest inclusion of examples of good land practises such as tree planting, clearing limits to reduce salinity levels.	1	Yes, p. 31	Amend Recommendation 1.	1(e)
8	Research and monitoring information should be used to : maintain and enhance the values of the waterways; assist the Dept of Agriculture, or other concerned groups, to evaluate agricultural practises; review policy regarding fishing in inland waterways.	1	No	Support for recommendations.	2(a)
9	Suggest removal of Recommendation 8 as environmental assessments are undertaken, as a matter of course, for all water supply developments.	1	Yes, p. 32	Remove recommendation.	1(c)
10	Suggest adding Dempster and St Marys Rivers, Pabelup Lake and Doggers Swamp to Map 5.	1	Yes, Map 5	Add information.	1(e)
11	Editorial changes suggested.	1	Yes, p. 31	Editorial changes if appropriate.	1(e)
12	Add 'Cs-137 core sampling' to Recommendation 10.	1	No	Sampling techiniques may change over period of this plan.	2(c)
	6.4 Landscape *7 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations (Table 6).	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	A draft 'Squatters Shacks Policy' is being prepared by State Planning Commission and it may be of value to talk of the principles behind that policy when referring to 'human-imposed spot developments'.	1	No	The installation of squatters shacks in the Park contradicts departmental policies. The Pt Ann shack is a pre-existing anomaly.	2(c)
3	To close an area because it cannot be accessed with a road that is not visible is ridiculous.	1	No	Only unnecessary roads/tracks will be closed and rehabilitated.	2(c)
4	Many roads and tracks are well designed with planning taking into consideration the landscape viewshed including that from mountain summits.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
5	Scenic quality is overstated : much of the sand plain should be classified as low according to the definition (p.34).	1	No	Views are extensive and include mountain relief in vista.	2(c)
	7.0 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT **7.1 Vegetation** *5 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Suggest addition of 'fauna habitat' to Recommendation 6.	1	Yes, p. 39	Amend Recommendation 6.	1(a,d)
	7.2 Flora *7 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations (except that discussed below).	3	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Oppose further field research on central peaks at this stage (Rec's. 7 and 8)	3	No	Research will only be conducted under strict dieback hygiene measures.	2(c)
3	Oppose Recommendation 8 for which it is considered unwarranted to undertake the same tasks unless a priority species is threatened by a particular activity.	1	Yes, p. 40	Remove recommendation.	1(a,d)
4	The proposed herbarium should be altered to a complete herbarium or a herbarium with priority species and related species.	1	Yes, p. 40	Add "with emphasis on" to Recommendation 2.	1(a,d)
5	Suggest local input into the establishment of the herbarium.	1	No	Support for recommendation.	2(a)
6	Verticordia aff./cf. helichrysantha is known from two populations (Table 8).	1	Yes, p. 41	Amend Table 8.	1(a)
	7.3 Fauna *14 submissions.*				
1	Commend recommendations for management of fauna.	5	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Should stipulate control of all introduced species.	3	No	Covered under 9.3 Animal Pests	2(c)
3	Invertebrate fauna are not covered in plan.	2	Yes, p. 47	Add information.	1(a)
4	An invertebrate fauna survey should be carried out.	2	Yes, p. 48	Add new Recommendation 7.	1(a,d)
5	Need to clarify as both Western and Brown are used to describe Bristlebird.	1	Yes, p. 45	Editorial changes if appropriate.	1(e)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
6	Concern for protection of Ground Parrot. Burns in the area of Ground Parrots pose too high a risk given the status of the species.	1	No	Balance is needed for protection. Not all habitat is traversed by tracks and firebreaks. Refer also to revised fire plan (9.2 Fire).	2(d)
7	Recognition of the possibility of habitat change (through fire and dieback) might be appropriate in the plan.	1	Yes, p. 42	Add information.	1(a)
8	There is undue emphasis on the northern part of the Park, whereas the whole Park should be accorded equal protection and the subject of equal research effort.	1	Yes, p. 42	Relax emphasis on northern area provided this relaxation does not put any species at risk.	1(a)
9	Fifty hectares of crop should be grown in centre of Park to help maintain the animals within.	1	No	Contradicts departmental policies.	2(b)
10	Further research is required regarding possible rare fauna habitats before extensive burning is carried out.	1	No	Covered in Recommendations 3 and 6b.	2(c)
11	Suggest addition of reference to South Coast Regional Plan (line 1, p.42)	1	Yes, p. 42	Add reference.	1(a)
	8.0 CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT **8.1 Aboriginal** *5 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	3	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Recommend that CALM arranges for a survey of the Park to enable a management plan for Aboriginal sites.	2	No	Management of Aboriginal sites is provided for in this plan.	2(c)
3	All areas to be developed should be surveyed for Aboriginal sites before any work occurs.	1	Yes, p. 49	Include appropriate wording in Recommendation 1.	1(a,d)
4	Reference to grave at Quaalup should be removed as it is the grave of Mary McGlade, a woman of Irish descent.	1	Yes, p. 49	Remove statement from plan.	1(b)
5	It may be of value to insert a map to show approximate locations of sites.	1	No	Information is confidential under Aboriginal Heritage Act.	2(b)
	8.2 European *6 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Question the expense of valuable funds on the reconstruction of the rabbit proof fence.	1	No	Only parts of the fence are to be re-constructed, subject to available funding.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
3	Other evidence of European activities can be gauged from the study of aerial photographs.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
4	It is incorrect to refer to Colletts track being cleared through the Park, as the track was cleared before the Park came into existence. Collett was responsible for clearing the connection between Devils Creek Rd and the rabbit proof fence (12km).	1	Yes, p. 51	Amend text accordingly. Replace "40-50 km" with "12 km".	1(a)
5	History of individual activities could be enlarged upon and would provide good material for interpretation.	1	Yes, p. 50	Add information where appropriate. More detail will be given in actual interpretive material.	1(e)
6	Some protection is needed for the stone ruin at Echo Glen.	1	Yes, p. 51	Add new Recommendation 2.	1(d)
7	Mine shafts off Bell track and at Naendip need to be made safe to protect visitors and CALM staff.	1	Yes, p. 51	Safety measures will be affected here and at other places.	1(d)
8	The remains of a small farming enterprise exist on the Fitzgerald River below Telegraph Track.	1	Yes, p. 50	See Comment 5, this section.	1(a)
9	Suggest addition of reference to L. Sandiford (1988) (Para 2, p51).	1	Yes, p. 50	Editorial change if appropriate.	1(a)
10	Suggest addition of "sites such as" to Recommendation 1 (p51).	1	Yes, p. 51	Reword Recommendation 1.	1(e)
11	It may be of value to insert map to show the approximate locations of known sites.	1	No	This will be considered in relation to the overall information and interpretation program.	2(c)
	9.0 PROTECTION MANAGEMENT **9.1 Disease** *Washdown Stations*				
1	Support the concept of washdown stations	10	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Washdown stations are not practical in FRNP. Problems include water restrictions, drainage, maintenance and policing.	7	Yes, p. 52	There are obvious practical difficulties with dieback washdown stations and their introduction and use was very carefully reconsidered. The more widespread occurrence of existing known dieback infections and the serious concern over likely additional infections required that these recommendations be re-addressed and the section be re-written.	1(a,c,d)
3	Can't be left to the integrity of visitors to follow the required procedures.	4	No	This has been acknowledged.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
4	Consideration should be given to a drive-through sump containing dieback fungicide.	3	Yes, p. 52	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	1(a,c,d)
5	Water restrictions will severely limit effectiveness of washdown stations.	3	Yes, p. 52	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	1(a,c,d)
6	Gates should be installed at all entrances and manned.	2	No	Resources and finances are limited.	2(a,b)
7	I would be prepared to build and maintain a washdown station at Quaalup.	1	No	This has been acknowledged.	2(c)
8	Suggest the use of elevation ramps.	1	Yes, p. 52	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	1(a,c,d)
9	Suggest the use of washdown tickets (like parking tickets).	1	Yes, p. 52	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	1(a,c,d)
10	Recommend the installation of automatic rather than manual washdown facilities.	1	Yes, p. 52	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	1(a,c,d)
11	Washdown procedures are not discussed in plan.	1	Yes, p. 52	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	1(a,c,d)
12	Question the need to washdown vehicles in summer after long dry spell.	1	No	Covered in text.	2(c)
	Bushwalkers				
1	Walkers are free to wander and may spread dieback.	8	Yes, p. 55	The risk factors for 4WD vehicles are far greater than for walkers. Access for walkers will be restricted when necessary.	1(a,b,c,d,e)
2	Bushwalkers should consult ranger prior to entering wilderness area.	1	Yes, p. 55	Walkers will be notified to ensure footwear is free of mud and soil. Self-registration and dieback education is also provided for.	1(a,b,c,d,e)
3	No mention is made of access controls on hikers.	1	Yes, p. 55	Access for walkers will be restricted when necessary.	1(a,c,d)
4	Will some kind of 'dip' be required for walkers also?	1	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(a)
5	Suggest an education program for walkers on dieback.	1	No	This is provided for.	2(c)
6	Impossible to regulate bushwalkers to clean their boots.	1	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(c)
	Access				
1	Recommend considering the closure of most areas of the Park until such time as economically viable means of dieback control are known.	12	Yes, p. 55	The plan provides for the temporary closure of all or parts of the Park following rain using the same criteria presently applied to 4WD tracks. i.e. closed when vehicles pick up mud and soil. Refer to 13.0 Access for prescriptions on individual roads/tracks.	1(a,c,d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
2	Support closure of 4WD tracks following rain.	8	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Opposed to the existence of 4WD tracks in the Park.	2	No	Aim is to provide a range of recreation opportunities.	2(c,d)
4	Plan does not address dieback infection on Hamersley Drive or West Mt. Barren Road.	1	Yes, p. 55	The plan has been amended to point out that the road is well-drained, the footpath remains closed, and the information bay is closed. The aim is to seal the road, investigate re-opening the path and to interpret dieback in the information bay at a confirmed dieback site.	1(c,d,e)
5	Bitumen roads are the only acceptable surfaces for dieback.	1	No	See Comment 4, this sub-section.	2(c)
6	Dieback proposals seem severe on recreation access.	1	No	Dieback is the primary management concern in the Park.	2(d)
7	Use the infection on Hamersley Drive to educate public.	1	Yes, p. 55	See Comment 4, this sub-section.	1(c,d,e)
8	Need immediate and ongoing monitoring of all firelines and access tracks to detect any spread of dieback.	1	Yes, p. 55	Dieback sampling and survey will be conducted on tracks and firelines. Refer also to 13.0 Access.	1(a,e)
	Implications of Dieback Recommendations				
1	For any dieback control measures to work there needs to be a high level of public understanding and co-operation.	6	Yes, p. 56	Although this is already being addressed in public display/ interpretive materials, it is an ongoing requirement, and further efforts are required.	1(d)
2	Recommendations do not ensure hygiene.	6	No	Prescriptions enforce dieback hygiene measures.	2(c,d)
3	Support the principal goal of disease protection.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
4	Support for the recommendations.	3	No	No change sought.	2(a)
5	Need to verify whether infection on Bell Track drains into Dempster catchment.	3	Yes, p. 53	It has been confirmed that infection drains into Dempster catchment.	1(a)
6	It may be prudent to adopt policies that will restrict the rate of spread but the claim that dieback is the major determinant of management strategies is not justified.	1	No	Spread already appears worse than previously thought and the fire has set back interpretation another 5-7 years. Caution for the life of the plan is a small price to pay when viewed against the value of the Park for future generations.	2(c)
7	The amount of rain needs to be defined (Xmm) and guidelines for the period before the road is re-opened need to be established.	1	Yes, p. 55	Amend plan. Decision is based on ranger's judgement using guidelines equally applied to 4WD and 2WD tracks, and footpaths.	1(a,d)
8	Extrapolate Recommendation 13 to include walk trails.	1	Yes, p. 55	This is implied but could be clarified.	1(e)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
9	Map 7 should be updated with known dieback hazards.	1	No	Covered in Recommedation 2.	2(c)
10	Update last paragraph (p.53) with numbers of known infections.	1	Yes, p. 53	Add information.	1(a)
11	Move Recommendation 14 closer to top of list of recommendations.	1	Yes, p. 55	Editorial change.	1(d)
12	Editorial changes suggested.	1	Yes, p. 53	Editorial changes if appropriate.	1(e)
	Other Comments and Suggestions				
1	Dieback not introduced or spread by locals.	5	No	No change sought.	2(c)
2	Dieback problem is being used as a smokescreen to enable CALM further control.	3	No	Dieback is a serious threat to the conservation values of the Park.	2(c,d)
3	Animals spread dieback naturally.	3	No	Animals may contribute to spread. There is little information available as yet and further investigations are required.	2(a,c)
4	CALM should attempt to isolate and eradicate infections.	2	Yes, p. 56	May be possible if technology is established. Modify text to explain.	1(a,e)
5	Plan should recognise that CALM management practises may contribute to spread of dieback.	1	No	CALM does recognise this risk and entry to risk areas has been strictly controlled by permits since track closures were introduced.	2(c)
6	Dieback was planted in Park by CALM.	1	No	Contradicts departmental policies.	2(b)
7	Dieback in gravel pit on Highway 1 should be investigated.	1	No	This infection has been investigated by CALM and MRD.	2(c)
8	Recommend trials using acacias to rehabilitate areas affected by dieback. It may be that they inhibit the growth of fungi.	1	No	This has not been proven and is not practical on the broad scale.	2(b)
9	Any lessening of the nutrient cycle, as in regular control burning, will cause stress and force the evolutionary process into impoverishment resulting in disease.	1	No	This has been acknowledged.	2(c)
10	Policies and regulations are required for control of dieback on private property, farmlands, orchards, shire lands, other govt. land, exploration activities, walktrails, private contractors, wildflower pickers etc.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
11	Dieback should be declared under prohibited diseases Act with heavy fines for contravention.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
12	A mobile incinerator should be utilised for destroying infected plants.	1	No	Not practical on a broad scale.	2(b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
13	As much as possible of the high - very high disease hazard area should be placed in strict quarantine.	1	Yes, p. 55	Plan provides for restrictions on access. Refer to 13.0 Access.	1(d)
14	Encourage visitors to travel through Parks in order of increasing dieback risk.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
15	The use of unwashed heavy duty equipment for emergency fire control surely does not lend itself to good dieback prevention.	1	No	This is recognised and all equipment is subject to dieback hygiene measures.	2(c)
16	It would be appropriate to recognise in the plan, the possibility of habitat change by dieback.	1	Yes, p. 53	Re-emphasize in dieback section.	1(e)
	9.2 Fire In December 1989 a series of lightning strikes followed by extreme fire weather conditions resulted in major fires within the Park. Consequently, the fire management section of the draft plan needed to be completely re-addressed. All submittors to the DMP were encouraged to submit further comments as a result of the wildfires. In addition, a Fire Working Group was convened comprising the Chief Fire Control Officers of both the Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe Shires, the Bush Fires Board and CALM Operations staff. This group prepared an amended fire management plan to replace the section in the DMP. This was based primarily upon fire protection provisions, which was reviewed in a position paper by CALM based on a series of principles relating to dieback disease, fire management, wilderness and recreation access. Both proposals have been considered as submissions to the DMP.				
	Fire Breaks and Buffers				
1	Firebreaks of 100-400m are excessive: 50-100m would be adequate.	6	No	Width refers to low-fuel buffers and not cleared firebreaks.	2(c)
2	Complete burning of existing scrub-rolled buffer on western boundary, and carry out internal block burns (Blocks 1 and 16) within 5 years.	5	Yes, Map 9	Burns will be carried out in conjunction with Jerramungup District Fire Plan and consultation with local groups and local brigades.	1(a,d)
3	Scrub-roll and burn protective buffer adjacent to Jacup ranger's residence.	5	No	Covered in Recommendation 2(f).	2(c)
4	Install scrub-rolled buffer along old Copper Mine access track.	5	Yes, p. 60	The Park is subdivided into a number of cells utilising existing access to define boundaries. Cells will be separated by narrow low-fuel buffers established by scrub-rolling.	1(a,d)
5	Install a low fuel buffer through the 1985 fire area adjacent to Telegraph track to provide a low fuel strip separating central Park area and ranges to south.	5	Yes, Map 9	See Comment 4, this sub-section.	1(a,d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
6	Scrub-roll along old northern boundary and widen out within 5 years.	5	Yes, p. 60	See Comment 4, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
7	Investigate retention of 1989 fireline from Red Peak to Mt Drummond.	5	Yes, p. 60	Firelines constructed in the 1989 fires will be incorporated as cell boundaries where appropriate.	1(a,d)
8	Buffer to be established north of Telegraph track between 1985 fire and Quoin Head track.	5	Yes, p. 60	See Comment 4, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
9	Scrub-roll western boundary of Quaalup from Gairdner Rd to Gordon Inlet Rd and along Gordon Inlet Rd.	5	Yes, p. 60	See Comment 4, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
10	Scrub-roll buffer along Gordon Inlet Rd from 3 year old aerial burns to 1989 fire.	5	Yes, p. 60	See Comment 4, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
11	Buffers impinge on landscape values.	5	No	The location of buffers will be based on field surveys so as to minimise dieback risk, soil erosion and landscape impacts.	2(c)
12	The use of wind driven buffers should be tried first where its deemed suitable.	4	Yes, p. 61	The use of wind-driven buffers is being investigated. Initial results have been positive.	1(d)
13	Firebreaks must be maintained to be effective.	3	No	All tracks/firebreaks are subject to dieback hygiene measures.	2(c)
14	Use natural firebreaks, eg. salt flats, lake beds, wherever possible.	2	No	These are used wherever possible. Their suitability is considered in annual reviews and works programs.	2(c)
15	The narrowest effective buffer should be aimed for at all times.	2	No	See Comment 11, this sub-section.	2(c)
16	Buffers of cleared land create barriers to small animals.	2	No	Buffers are necessary to protect overall conservation values.	2(c)
17	Only boundary buffers are required - no internal buffers along cell edges.	2	No	See Comment 16, this sub-section.	2(c)
18	Effective buffer areas need to be 1/2 mile (1 km) in width.	2	No	Buffers will be widened by open-edge burning in some cases.	2(c,d)
19	Fire buffers should be established outside Park boundary on private or public land.	2	No	This is being considered and will be instigated where possible.	2(c)
20	Firebreaks are useless in extreme conditions due to speed of fire front.	1	No	Firebreaks provide positions from which to conduct suppression operations.	2(c)
21	Totally against artificial barriers - leave fires to burn naturally.	1	No	Illegal under Bush Fires Act.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
22	Buffer on the north side of Bremer Bay is essential.	1	Yes, Map 9	This area is proposed to be prescribe burned during the life of plan.	1(a)
23	System of firebreaks would destroy the wilderness experience.	1	No	Firebreaks in the wilderness zone will not be accessed for fire management prior to review in 1995.	2(c)
24	Buffer zones may be constructed by harvesting/mowing using the harvested bush for rehabilitation.	1	No	This will be considered in the implementation phase.	2(a,c)
25	Current firebreaks are not suitable.	1	Yes, p. 60	Fire plan has been re-written.	1(a,b)
26	Cells should be separated by chained and burnt buffers 200 m wide internally and 100 m wide adjacent to farmland.	1	Yes, p. 60	See Comment 4, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
27	Fuel reduction on buffers should be at about 5 year intervals.	1	No	Fuel reduction on buffers will be carried out as determined through annual review of the fire plan. The interval period will vary.	2(c)
28	Consideration should be given to the use of wind-driven strips within the northern upland area with due regard to important fauna habitat sites.	1	Yes, p. 62	See Comment 12, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
	Heavy Machinery				
1	Telegraph track to be upgraded from Drummond to Quoin Head track to allow access to heavy machinery.	4	No	See Comment 1, Access sub-section.	2(b,c,d)
2	The use of unwashed heavy duty equipment for emergency control does not lend itself to good dieback prevention.	1	No	This is recognised and all equipment is subject to dieback hygiene measures.	2(c)
3	Use of bulldozers to clear firebreaks will aid spread of dieback.	1	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(c)
4	Use of heavy machinery is not required under a patch burning system.	1	Yes, p. 59	Mosaic of burning will reduce need to use heavy machinery.	1(e)
5	It is ridiculous and dangerous to take heavy earth-moving equipment into the Park.	1	No	See Comments 2 and 4, this sub-section.	2(c)
6	No machinery should be allowed in, ie. bulldozers, graders.	1	No	See Comments 2 and 4, this sub-section.	2(c)
	Prescribed Burning				
1	Support regular prescribed burning.	13	Yes, Map 9	It is proposed to use prescribed fire both in narrow buffers and within designated management cells. Scrubrolling will be used to establish buffers.	1(a,d)
2	Scrub-roll edge along Quiss Rd if edge burn is not effective.	5	Yes, Map 9	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
3	Burn scrub-rolled strip on western side of Rabbit Proof Fence.	5	Yes, Map 9	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
4	Burn scrub-rolling along northern boundary. Consideration should be given to additional scrub-rolling to widen buffers in 4-5 years time if this cannot be done by free edging standing bush onto existing buffers.	5	Yes, Map 9	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
5	Carry out edge burn along Quiss Rd.	5	Yes, Map 9	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
6	Fuel reduction east of West River in north-east corner of Park.	5	Yes, Map 9	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
7	Complete buffer burning along Hamersley Drive.	5	Yes, Map 9	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
8	Scrub-roll north-east side of Pabelup Dr and internal block burn to Fitzgerald River.	5	Yes, Map 9	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
9	Undertake further prescribed burning using existing burn boundaries in buffer area north of Bremer Bay to the Gordon Inlet Rd.	5	Yes, Map 9	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
10	Burning should be carried out in late summer - autumn.	5	No	Burning will be carried out, as conditions permit, in late summer-autumn plus at other times of year to create diversity.	2(c)
11	Scrub-roll and burn section of Fitzgerald track from 1989 fire boundary to Twertup track.	4	Yes, Map 9	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
12	Low density burns should be used via aerial burning.	2	Yes, p. 62	Aerial burning will be conducted if practical and if buffers are already in place.	1(a,d)
13	Regular burning of low fuel buffers is more harmful to ecology.	2	No	Fuel reduction on buffers will only be carried out as needed.	2(c)
14	Strip/patch burn the north-west section of Park as soon as possible.	2	Yes, Map 9	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,d)
15	Any lessening of the nutrient cycle, such as regular prescribed fire, will cause stress and force the evolutionary process into impoverishment resulting in disease.	1	No	Prescribed burning will only be carried out as needed.	2(c)
16	Prescribed fire in Ground Parrot habitat poses too high a risk given the status of the species, and requires further consideration.	1	No	Based on current knowledge, it is considered to be a greater risk to leave totally unburnt. This is subject to current research.	2(c)
17	Encourage minimal use of prescribed burning.	1	No	See Comment 15, this sub-section.	2(c)
18	Support the cellular concept of fire control.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(a)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
19	Strip burning should be carried out every 6-8 years.	1	No	Burning will only be carried out as needed.	2(c)
20	Suggest 15 year rotational cool burning of small areas in autumn using natural barriers.	1	No	See Comments 10 and 13, this sub-section.	2(c)
21	Need to establish a fuel reduced zone on Park boundary.	1	No	This is provided for.	2(c)
	Chaining and Burning				
1	Opposed to the chaining and burning technique.	9	Yes, p. 60	These comments were made prior to December '89 wildfires. During those fires, this technique was essential in fire suppression under extreme conditions. It will be particularly important in the short term while instigating other means of control.	1(c,d,e)
2	If chaining is necessary then avoid bare soil areas.	3	No	This will be taken into consideration.	2(c)
3	Use rubber-tyred tractors when chaining.	2	No	This will be taken into consideration.	2(c)
4	Hard nut trees shed seed after chaining which are reduced to ash when burnt.	2	No	Covered in text. This is subject to current research.	2(c)
5	There was no strip of bush left between firebreaks and farmland in recent chaining operation.	2	No	Where possible, a strip of bush will be retained between private property and perimeter firebreaks.	2(c)
6	Rehabilitate areas in Gairdner River bed which have been chained.	1	No	Refer to 9.5 Rehabilitation.	2(c)
7	Avoid creek and riverine beds and slopes, breakaways, road verges, and immediately adjacent to cleared paddocks.	1	No	This will be taken into consideration.	2(c)
8	CALM does not have technology to burn chained vegetation unless separated from standing bush with fire break.	1	No	This has been acknowledged. New techniques may be developed in the future.	2(a,c)
9	CALM should seek Council approval when chaining and burning on road verges adjacent to or adjoining the Park.	1	Yes, p. 62	This will be covered in plan.	1(a)
10	There was no local consultation before chaining and burning was carried out.	1	No	CALM will liaise with Bush Fires Board, local authorities, brigades and landowners on aspects of fire management.	2(c)
	Wildfire Suppression				
1	Large areas of the Park are inaccessible to fire fighting equipment.	3	Yes, p. 56	Fire plan has been re-written.	1(a)
2	The only possible controller of a wildfire in the Park is a CALM officer.	3	No	CALM will continue to work closely with the CFCO's of both Shires and with the Bush Fires Board. Control will be as defined within the provisions of the Bush Fires Act.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
3	The controller of a wildfire must be known well in advance.	2	Yes, p. 62	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	1(c,d,e)
4	Computerisation of relevant wildfire data would be the most effective method of analysing details.	2	Yes, p. 63	Modelling will be used as technology improves. Needs elaboration in text.	1(e)
5	Support the development of water points (Recommendation 5, p.63).	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
6	CALM should arrange regular exercises on co-operation techniques with local brigades and the Bush Fires Board.	2	Yes, p. 63	Amend Recommendation 7.	1(d)
7	A basic fire unit could be housed at Quaalup.	1	No	This has been acknowledged.	2(a)
8	The responsibility for escaped wildfires needs to be addressed.	1	No	Addressed in provisions of Bush Fires Act.	2(c)
9	Recommendation 4, p.63, not totally feasible due to reliance on internal low fuel buffers.	1	Yes, p.59	Fire plan has been re-written .	1(a)
10	A more detailed containment system should be devised.	1	No	This has been addressed.	2(c)
	Access				
1	Drummond Track should be maintained for fire control.	12	Yes, p. 62	Telegraph Track (between Fitzgerald Inlet and Marshes Beach turn-off), Drummond Track, Twin Bays Track, the southern half of Bell Track, the fireline between Red Peak and Mt Drummond, and Fitzgerald South Track will not be accessed for fire management prior to 1995, except in a life threatening emergency. A major review of access requirements will commence in 1995.	1(a,e)
2	Telegraph Track should be maintained for fire control.	8	Yes, p. 62	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,e)
3	Retain southern section of Bell track open for fire purposes.	4	Yes, p. 62	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a,e)
4	Existing tracks are essential for fire control.	2	No	This is recognised.	2(c)
5	Need to split Park in two with a new road running east-west through middle of Park.	1	No	Contradicts departmental policies.	2(b)
6	Need immediate and ongoing monitoring of all firelines and access tracks to detect any spread of dieback.	1	No	Refer to 9.1 Disease.	2(c)
7	In the short term, the section of Telegraph Track between Fitzgerald Inlet and Quoin Head will not be necessary for fire fighting access.	1	Yes, p. 62	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
8	Bell track not necessary for life of plan.	1	Yes, p. 62	See Comment 1, this sub-section. Also refer to 13.0 Access.	1(a,e)
9	Consideration should be given to re-alignment of Fitzgerald South track around Perkins Rock to the west.	1	No	This has been considered.	2(c)
10	Fire management tracks should be formed to a minimum of 6 m wide with visibility on bends guaranteed to 200 m minimium.	1	No	Refer to 13.0 Access.	2(c)
	Roadworks				
1	Unsightly heaps have been revealed by 1989 wildfires - should be removed and their occurrence prevented in future roadworks.	1	No	This will be considered.	2(c)
2	Accumulated dead vegetation on road verges from recent slashing is unsightly. Cut vegetation should be removed and used for rehabilitation.	1	No	Action has already been taken.	2(c)
3	Upgrading causes problems. The old 4WD tracks didn't erode, but once a grader disturbs the soil, erosion begins.	1	No	This is recognised.	2(c)
4	Firebreaks need to be well-drained to avoid erosion.	1	No	This is recognised.	2(c)
	Community Involvement				
1	Local people should be used wherever possible in fire management and control.	1	Yes, p. 63	Perimeter prescribed burning will be carried out in conjunction with local volunteer fire brigades and neighbouring landholders.	1(a,b)
2	The recent fires highlighted the value of local knowledge regarding the control of fires in this area.	1	No	No change sought.	2(c)
3	CALM should subscribe to local newspapers to keep its finger on the local pulse.	1	No	Steps to improve relations between CALM and local residents have been instigated.	2(c)
4	CALM should consult with Jerramungup Shire when conducting works adjacent to Shire reserves and roadways.	1	No	Provided for in plan.	2(c)
5	Recommend development of alternative strategies with both Shires.	1	Yes, p. 63	Addressed in re-written fire plan.	1(a)
6	There will be no improvement in the CALM image until there is sufficient staff to attend most local meetings.	1	No	Refer to 19.0 Staff.	2(c)
7	Plan should include a program to encourage local participation in fire management.	1	Yes, p. 63	Add information.	1(d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	Other Comments and Suggestions				
1	Support V.R.M concepts for buffer burns along roads and firebreak construction.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Past fire management has been inadequate.	2	No	Resources have been limited or unavailable.	2(c,d)
3	Large fire should not be allowed to happen again.	2	Yes, p. 59	This is acknowledged in revised fire plan.	1(a)
4	Clean water dams, fire fighting vehicles and manpower to be on hand.	2	Yes, p. 63	Addressed in revised fire plan.	1(a)
5	CALM hasn't enough equipment or manpower in the area.	2	No	Refer to 19.0 Staff and 21.0 Funding.	2(c)
6	Cheaper to have regular aerial surveillance and immediate suppression rather than a recurrence of 1989 wildfire.	1	No	Staff surveillance on days of extreme fire risk and fire-fighting equipment will be on standby.	2(c)
7	High costs are associated with bringing in fire fighting staff and equipment.	1	Yes, p. 63	Addressed in revised fire plan.	1(a)
8	There appears to be no provision for the safety of Park users, particularly backpackers.	1	No	This is provided for in revised fire plan.	1(a,b)
9	Recommend a wildfire threat analysis be undertaken.	1	No		2(c)
10	CALM should supply funding for consultancy work to provide fire plan.	1	No	Fire plan has been re-written.	2(c)
11	Seek compensation for loss of private property, income supplement to families and full pay and compensation for volunteers.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
12	Sterilisation of water would require the necessary capsules to be distributed to fire brigade captains.	1	Yes, p. 63	Reword Recommendation 6.	1(e)
13	Percentage of origins of fires in Park are not mentioned in plan.	1	No	Data unavailable at time of writing.	2(c)
14	Concerned at the lack of water for firefighting.	1	Yes, p. 63	This has been addressed in revised fire plan.	1(a)
15	Too large an area is left unburnt.	1	No	Comment made prior to 1989 wildfires.	2(c)
16	Commend the fire plan.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
17	Support research and monitoring program.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
18	Will not accept the fire plan.	1	No	Comment made prior to 1989 wildfires.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
19	CALM staff are inexperienced in use of equipment and control of heath fires.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a,c)
20	The public has less respect for burnt areas - information and education are needed for tourists and locals.	1	No	It is proposed to implement programs to inform and educate Park visitors regarding the fire management program.	2(c)
21	Plan should include an arrangement for locating fire equipment within the local bush fire brigade system.	1	Yes, p. 63	This is provided for in revised fire plan.	1(d)
22	Editorial changes suggested.	1	Yes, p. 60	Editorial changes if appropriate.	1(e)
	9.3 Animal Pests *12 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	6	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Recommend an eradication program that brings about the complete removal of feral bees.	2	No	Finances and resources are unavailable. Other prescriptions have a higher priority.	2(b)
3	Consideration should be given to the following: • should Starlings become established in the Park, APB officers be authorised to carry firearms in the Park, establish campsites in the Park, wash down their own vehicles should entry into a dieback area be necessary and use 4WD vehicles in the Park;	1	No	Camping and washdowns will be subject to the same conditions that apply to everyone else.	2(c,d)
	• the Regional APB officer should be informed where baiting of foxes and dogs is carried out;		No	CALM does do some baiting in northern areas. There is no objection to APB being made aware of this.	2(c)
	• that APB doggers be allowed in the Park with traps and firearms should a wild dog problem occur that cannot be dealt with by other means;		No	CALM will consult with the APB in such an event.	2(b)
	• rabbit control using sodium monofluroacetate be carried out by APB officers, when in their opinion, there is a requirement for the work to be done.		No	CALM will consult with the APB in order to identify essential locations for rabbit control. Control methods will be assessed for their impacts on conservation values.	2(b)
4	Objectives should be expanded to reflect the APB's charter and to include community protection objectives.	1	No	The primary goal is the protection of native plant and animal communities and species, and the processes which sustain them.	2(b)
5	Suggest using a fence to control feral cats and foxes entering the area.	1	No	Finances for boundary fence and its maintenance are unavailable.	2(b,c)
6	CALM should be responsible for the impact of kangaroos on adjacent farmlands.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
7	It is not stated how control of the various feral species is to be achieved.	1	No	Techniques for feral species control are developed in conjunction with the APB and may change over time. Thus they are not specified.	2(a,c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
8	Suggest addition of 'enclaves' to Recommendation 1, p.64.	1	Yes, p. 64	Add 'enclaves' to Recommendation 1.	1(e)
9	Spread of the Kookaburra could decimate native wildlife.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a,b)
10	Recommend a study on number of brumbies in the Park, and their ability to carry dieback.	1	No	Where possible, feral cattle and horses are to be removed.	2(c)
11	Suggest care be taken with public relations regarding the removal of the horses.	1	No	See Comment 7, this section.	2(a,c)
12	Rangers should be issued with shot guns.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
	9.4 Weeds *7 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Bridle Creeper (Myrsiphyllum asparagoides) should be added to the list of invasive plants to be monitored and controlled.	4	Yes, p. 65	Add information for clarity.	1(a)
3	Objectives should be expanded to reflect the APB's charter and to include community protection objectives.	1	No	The primary goal is the protection of native plant and animal communities and species, and the processes which sustain them.	2(b)
4	African box thorn is neither a declared nor a pest plant in the Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe Shires and there is no obligation on CALM to control it.	1	Yes, p. 65	Remove references to Box Thorn as a declared species.	1(a)
5	CALM should place special emphasis on surveillance for and spread of the declared doublegee in the Park.	1	Yes, p. 66	Add information to Recommendation 3.	1(a,d)
6	It is not stated how control is to be carried out.	1	No	Techniques for feral species control are developed in conjunction with the APB and may change over time. Thus they are not specified.	2(a,c)
7	Question the value of implementing the recommendations.	1	Yes, p. 66	Delete Recommendation 8.	1(c)
	9.5 Rehabilitation *5 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	5	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Property owners in enclaves should be encouraged to use native species.	1	Yes, p. 67	Amend Recommendation 2.	1(d)
3	Old and eroded tracks need to be ripped and covered with brush.	1	Yes, p. 67	Add new Recommendation 4.	1(d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
4	Rehabilitation of Point Ann requires shack to be removed.	1	No	Refer to 14.0 Recreation Sites.	2(c,d)
5	It may be possible to use volunteers for rehabilitation projects.	1	No	Covered in Recommendations 2 and 3.	2(c)
6	Direct seeding should be used during rehabilitation or plants from accredited dieback free nurseries.	1	Yes, p. 67	Amend Recommendation 1.	1(e)
7	CALM should experiment with a range of rehabilitation techniques in the Park.	1	Yes, p. 67	Add 'experiment' to Recommendation 4.	1(d)
	9.6 Gravel, Sand and Stone *2 submissions.*				
1	No extraction should be permitted within the Park.	1	No	Dieback risk is increased with introduced gravel.	2(b)
2	Support for recommendations.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Oppose extraction if it can be interpreted contrary to the intent statement that "These materials may only be extracted from the Park for use within the Park."	1	No	No change sought.	2(a,c)
	9.7 Pets (Domestic Animals) *6 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendation.	6	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Classification should be changed to 'Domestic Animals' to have any relevance with the CALM Act.	1	Yes, p. 68	Terminology will be amended to complement proposed amendments to the CALM Act.	1(c)
3	Public education as to why pets are not allowed in the Park should proceed.	1	Yes, p. 68	Add new Recommendation 2.	1(d)
	10.0 MANAGEMENT OF COMMERCIAL RESOURCE UTILISATION **10.1 Mining** *18 submissions.* This section has been revised in line with a change in Government policy, (Resolution of Conflict).				
1	Opposed to any mining and exploration in the Park.	14	Yes, p. 69	Plan has been amended in line with a change in Government policy. The Park is closed to exploration and mining.	1(a,c)
2	Support for recommendations.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
3	Recommend current applications for exploration licenses be rejected in the public's interest.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
4	Recommendation 2 should include comments on ensuring that any such operations are continuously monitored by persons/bodies independent of the company concerned. They should provide for the closure of the mine if Park values are threatened and for the establishment of a committee to examine the results of monitoring.	1	No	CALM will follow Government Policy on mining.	2(b)
5	The statement that 'some national parks of highest conservation value will never be opened for mining' is not supported by any legislation and should be removed.	1	No	CALM will follow Government Policy on mining.	2(b)
6	The suggestion that the Park be permanently closed to mining is unnecessarily final and should be removed from Recommendation 1.	1	No	CALM will follow Government Policy on mining.	2(b)
7	The Park does have potential mineral prospectivity which is being effectively quarantined from mineral exploration and mining.	1	No	CALM will follow Government Policy on mining.	2(b)
	10.2 Commercial Fishing *30 submissions, 11 proformas.* **General Comments** *23 submissions.*				
1	There should be no commercial fishing in the Park.	8	No	Licenses are administered by the Fisheries Dept for Hamersley and Gordon Inlets after consideration of fish stocks and both amateur and commercial fishing needs in these inlets.	2(b)
2	Professional fishermen have fished these waters some 100 years with no ill effects to the Park.	5	No	This has been acknowledged.	2(b)
3	Steps should be taken to phase out commercial fishing.	3	No	Commercial fishing is managed by the Fisheries Dept and is permitted in proclaimed fishing zones only.	2(b)
4	Support the recommendations.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
5	Commercial fishing should not be allowed in Gordon Inlet.	2	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(b)
6	Managed exploitation by commercial fishermen is essential to avoid wastage of large numbers of fish that would normally perish under dry or hypersaline conditions.	2	No	Management of fish stocks is administered by the Fisheries Dept.	2(b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
7	Small catches have been repeatedly taken in a number of years since 1970.	2	Yes, p. 70	Remove statement from text.	1(e)
8	Should distinguish between professional fishing 'within' and 'immediately joining' the Park eg. in inlets and from Park beaches as distinct from fishing in the Doubtful Islands area which is impossible to access by land except by passing through the Park.	1	Yes, p. 70	Clarify in text and amend Recommendation 2.	1(e)
9	Professional fishermen should be limited in their catches from river systems.	1	Yes, p. 71	Amend Recommendation 4.	1(e)
10	Transportation of commercial catches across the Park should be strictly controlled.	1	No	Covered in Recommendation 3.	2(c)
11	Upper pools of rivers should not be fished by anyone as they provide breeding stock for the estuaries.	1	Yes, p. 71	Amend Recommendation 4.	1(e)
12	CALM should periodically review policy regarding fishing in inland waterways both amateur and professional.	1	No	Covered in Recommendation 6.	2(c)
13	Condition preventing overnight camping at estuarine campsites (p.71) is totally unnecessary and unreasonable.	1	Yes, p. 70	Amend discussion. Public camping is available at Hamersley Inlet Shire Reserve and public land at Gordon Inlet mouth.	1(a)
14	As there is only limited inlet-based commercial fishing in the estuaries east of Albany, competition for space is not a problem, and is not likely to be a problem.	1	No	Competition for space may occur between commercial fishermen and other Park visitors.	2(b)
15	The impact of recreational fishing is a far more serious problem which needs to be considered.	1	No	This has been recognised.	2(c)
16	There should be no commercial fishing at Pt Ann and Fitzgerald Inlet.	1	No	Covered in Recommendations 2 and 4.	2(c)
17	Inlets should be closed to net fishing in times of abundant water.	1	No	Covered in Recommendations 4 and 5.	2(c)
18	Editorial changes suggested.	1	Yes, p. 70	Editorial changes if appropriate.	1(e)
	Access *12 submissions, 11 proformas.*				
1	Three types of proforma were received from commercial fishermen: • As a professional fisherman, I am most concerned about access to areas we have always fished. Recently including Gairdner River and Doubtful Island area, and previously Pt Ann and Pt Charles and Hamersley River area. It is most important that access by professional fishermen to these areas be a priority.	5	No	It is proposed that access for commercial fishermen be retained to Gordon Inlet, Trigelow Beach and the Doubtful Island area and be introduced for Hamersley Inlet.	2(b,c,d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	• I consider access by professional fishermen to all traditional fishing areas within the Park, must be given priority. This would include Pt Charles and Pt Ann Beaches.	4	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
	• Professional fishermen should be given access to all traditional fishing areas and where possible, camping grounds.	2	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section and Comment 13, previous section.	2(c)
2	Professional fishermen must be allowed access to all traditional waters within the Park.	8	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
3	Access conditions (p.71) are excessively restrictive.	2	Yes, p. 70	Amend Recommendation 3.	1(b)
4	Request access be permitted to House, Drage, Doubtful and Bremer Beaches for professional fishing.	2	Yes, p. 70	See Comment 8, previous sub-section.	1(e)
5	Suggest the inclusion of a committment that "CALM recognises its responsibility to provide access for professional fishermen to proclaimed fishing zones".	1	No	Access for professional fishermen has been provided for. See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
	10.3 Utilities and Services *14 submissions.*				
1	There should be no utility or service corridors in the Park.	8	No	Support for Objective 1.	2(a)
2	Support the recommendations.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Provision should be made for power supply to Quaalup.	2	No	A review of the impact of power line on landscape values should proceed.	2(b)
4	The proposed route for Quaalup service lines traverse 7 km of the natural environment zone.	1	No	This has been acknowledged.	2(c)
5	Alternative to SEC service line to Quaalup is to allow several diesel generators to belch out pollution.	1	No	No change sought.	2(b)
6	Provision should be made for power supply to Doubtful Island Peninsula.	1	No	Plan provides for assessment of proposals.	2(c)
7	Support placement of East Mt Barren SEC line underground.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
8	Opposed to the addition of areas of land to FRNP that would consequently necessitate the construction of water pipelines across them with their concomitant access roads and power lines.	1	No	Provisions for a pipeline can be met within existing policies.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
9	Editorial changes suggested.	1	Yes, p. 72	Editorial changes if appropriate.	1(e)
	10.4 Beekeeping *10 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	7	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Recommendations are clearly in conflict with CALM's draft policy statement on beekeeping in conserved areas, and therefore, the apiary site in question should be retained.	1	Yes, p. 73	It is draft CALM policy that for the next 5 years, until further research is conducted, the status quo will be maintained.	1(c)
3	The impact of bees on the indigenous invertebrate fauna has been overlooked.	1	No	Data unavailable at time of writing.	2(c)
4	The comments about the impact of bees on plant species seem unduly negative - some will be unaffected, others benefitted, and others adversely affected.	1	Yes, p. 73	Minor alterations to text including effect on fauna.	1(e)
5	Beekeeping and apiary sites should be allowed in 5g and VCL that may be set aside as multiple use areas.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
6	The apiary site was supposed to have been cancelled in 1985/86 - it was conditional upon one more year of use.	1	Yes, p. 73	Site has been cancelled. Amend text and Recommendation 1.	1(a,c)
	PART D. MANAGEMENT FOR RECREATION				
	11.0 RECREATION MANAGEMENT PHILOSOPHY *8 submissions.*				
1	Support for the recreation management philosophy.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Agree with the policy of restricted Park access as contained in Part D.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Protection of the environment should take precedence over recreation.	1	No	Covered in 2.0 Management Goals.	2(c)
4	This is in contradiction to the rest of the plan where emphasis is on conservation for its own sake. The contradiction is particularly concerning in respect to access to regions of the Park.	1	No	Protection of flora, fauna and landscape is the key factor in the provision of public access.	2(c)
5	Recreation philosophy doesn't sufficiently consider the needs of local people.	1	No	The recreation philosophy caters for equitable use for all visitors.	2(d)
6	Could include a statement about the prohibition of 'squatters shack' kind of development in line with SPC's draft 'squatters shacks policy'.	1	No	Not considered necessary.	2(b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
7	Important to refer to South Coast Regional Plan and point out that the philosophy is consistent with the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum of parks as presented in that plan.	1	Yes, p. 77	Add reference to South Coast Regional Plan.	1(e)
	12.0 RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES **12.1 The Region** *16 submissions.*				
1	Campsites at Starvation Bay and Mason's Bay are currently suffering from over-use because of park management philosophy.	12	No	A 100% increase in camping in FRNP is proposed over next 10 years and should reduce pressure in areas outside the Park. Technical advice is usually available from CALM to assist in management of these areas.	2(b)
2	The DMP shows little regard to the pressure that will be put on camping areas outside the Park.	2	Yes, p. 80	See Comment 1, this section.	1(d)
3	The statement that 'recreation developments in the Park compliment rather than compete with other recreational opportunities on the south coast and in the Shires of Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe is misleading and deleterious to the beaches adjacent to the Park.	1	No	See Comment 1, this section.	2(c)
4	Support for objective and strategy.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
5	Editorial changes suggested - add Hamersley Inlet to Table 13, p.79.	1	Yes, p. 79	Add information.	1(e)
	12.2 The Park *3 submissions.* Many submissions addressed the validity of the visitor survey, discussed in this section (refer to 1.4 Public Participation). Detailed comments on recreation opportunities in the Park are presented in 14.0 Recreation Sites and 15.0 Recreation Activities. Only three submissions addressed this section specifically.				
1	Support for the recommendations.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	It should be made clear, that these observations and data only derive from the period of the visitor survey. It is quite acceptable to use this background providing the limitations of the survey and its degree of compliance are clearly stated.	1	Yes, p. 80	Add information for clarity.	1(e)
3	Another survey should be conducted to look at the percentage of visitors coming from outside the Jerramungup/Ravensthorpe areas.	1	No	Not considered necessary.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	13.0 ACCESS The proposed changes to access within the Park attracted the highest number of submissions. As access and recreation sites go hand in hand and due to the complexity of their nature, submissions to these two sections (13.0 Access and 14.0 Recreation Sites) warranted special analysis. In line with the DMP, the Park was divided into western, central and eastern sections. Each road/track was considered individually and, for consistency, submissions referring to 13.1 Telegraph Track were included in this section. It should be noted that comments varied from broad generalisations to specific statements and that individual comments on access proposals were reviewed in light of the general interest expressed.				
	General Comments				
1	Opposed to proposal to limit and restrict access to traditional areas of the Park.	41	No	All access proposals were considered individually with regard to the more widespread incidence of dieback disease. Extra care must be taken to protect remaining uninfected areas, and to minimise any further spread in areas already infected. This may mean stricter control of all access (including foot access).	2(b,c,d)
2	Recommend considering the closure of most areas of the Park until such time as economically viable means of dieback control are known.	12	Yes, p. 87	The plan provides for the temporary closure of all or parts of the Park following rain using the same criteria presently applied to 4WD tracks, ie. closed when vehicles pick up mud and soil.	1(a,b,c,d,e)
3	Commend the establishment of the wilderness zone.	14	No	No change sought.	2(a)
4	Support closure of 4WD tracks following rain.	8	No	No change sought.	2(a)
5	Should have access to all beaches in the Park.	8	No	Aim is to provide a range of recreational opportunities.	2(c)
6	All 4WD access should remain as such.	7	No	Tracks are dealt with on an individual basis.	2(c)
7	Some maintenance of tracks required for erosion/drainage.	7	No	This is recognised.	2(c)
8	Support closure of central peaks to all access (Recommendation 9).	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
9	Support closure of 4WD access in centre of Park.	3	No	No change sought.	2(c)
10	Little or no mention in DMP of closed central section 2 years ago.	3	No	This is recognised.	2(c)
11	All access to be upgraded to all-weather (2WD) standard.	3	No	Tracks are dealt with on an individual basis.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
12	Opposed to having 4WD tracks in Park.	2	No	Aim is to provide a range of recreational opportunities.	2(c)
13	Most roads terminate down in hollows denying people with viewshed.	2	No	Tracks are dealt with on an individual basis.	2(c)
14	Should provide pull-over bays on main roads.	2	No	Covered in 16.0 Information, Interpretation and Education.	2(c)
15	There is discrepancy between Table 14 and Map 11.	2	Yes, Mp 10	Amend plan to correct discrepancy.	1(e)
16	Lack of access to coast will hamper search and rescue efforts.	1	No	Plan provides for access during life-threatening emergencies.	2(c)
17	Should provide for 4-wheel fishing bikes with balloon tyres on beaches.	1	No	Use of these vehicles is subject to same conditions as other 4WDs.	2(c)
18	A.P.B. should be allowed unrestricted access to all areas of Park after briefing with local CALM staff.	1	No	All access is regulated by dieback hygiene measures.	2(b)
19	Off-road vehicles use the Hunter River area adjoining land on Res. 2524 Pt. 3266 and 31737. By-laws are being developed for their management.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
20	Impact of 4WD's on breeding birds should be evaluated by an independent observer to avoid unwarranted beach closures.	1	No	Covered in Recommendation 12.	2(c)
21	CALM should consult locals prior to any track closure.	1	Yes, p. 88	Amend plan to provide for consultation on future permanent road closures.	1(d)
22	Support all access recommendations.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
23	4WD tracks should be clearly identified as such.	1	Yes, p. 85	Amend accordingly.	1(d)
24	Old Ongerup Road is unlikely to receive further upgrading.	1	No	Funds from other sources will be investigated.	2(b)
25	Suggest use of information bays rather than erect more signs (Rec. 11)	1	No	Covered in 16.0 Information, Interpretation and Education.	2(c)
26	Opposed to closure of central peaks to bushwalkers (Rec. 9).	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
27	Oppose Rec. 11, p.89: Only Moir track should be considered for closure after rains.	1	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(c)
28	Need to define 'intervention' in Rec. 22, p.91.	1	Yes, p. 88	Reword Recommendation 22.	1(e)
29	Should delete last sentence in Rec. 5, p.84.	1	No	Not considered necessary.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
30	Add 'and geotextile treatments" to Rec. 6a, p.84.	1	Yes, p. 84	Amend Recommendation 6a.	1(d,e)
31	Editorial changes suggested.	1	Yes, p. 83	Editorial changes if appropriate.	1(e)
	Road Safety/Roadworks *12 submissions.*				
1	Corners of roads should be cleared to increase visibility.	9	Yes, p. 84	Amend Recommendation 4 to provide for road safety.	1(e)
2	Road safety must be a priority.	4	Yes, p. 84	Add statement to strategy in plan.	1(d)
3	Some roads are winding and dangerous with blind corners.	3	Yes, p. 84	See Comments 1 and 2, this sub-section.	1(e)
4	Cambre of roads needs to be corrected so vehicles don't slide out.	2	Yes, p. 84	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(e)
5	CALM should liaise with MRD in road construction.	2	No	CALM does liaise with MRD.	2(c)
6	Road works in the Park are a disgrace.	1	No	No change sought.	2(c)
7	Limestone has been successfully used as a road surface at 12-mile Beach.	1	No	Covered in Recommendation 6a.	2(c)
8	All access roads should be improved to a standard which would allow safe travel at 60 kph.	1	Yes, p. 84	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(e)
	Permit System *10 submissions.*				
1	Support the use of a permit system for access.	7	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Sceptical of the effectiveness of self-administered permits.	3	Yes, p. 84	Remove Recommendation 7. The most effective method of administering permits will be investigated.	1(b,e)
3	Suggest use of entrance tickets.	1	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(b,c,d)
	WESTERN SECTION **Pt Ann Road** Proposed Management: Assess need for realignment. *10 submissions.*				
1	Upgrading to 2WD resulted in increased degradation of site.	5	No	No change sought.	2(c)
2	Consider boat-trailers in any access developments.	3	Yes, p. 94	Refer to 14.0 Recreation Sites and 15.6 Boating.	1(b)
3	Pt Ann Road is winding and dangerous with blind corners.	2	No	Action has already been taken.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	Twertup Track Proposed Management: Assess need for realignment. Sheet where necessary. *2 submissions.*				
1	Suggest additional spur road from Field Studies Centre to Twertup Crossing.	1	No	Track to crossing will remain closed due to dieback concerns.	2(c)
2	A 2WD track should be made from Field Studies Centre to coal seam area.	1	No	Contradicts departmental policies.	2(b,c)
	Gordon Inlet Road Proposed Management: Upgrade to 2WD all weather. Assess need for realignment. *7 submissions.*				
1	Maintain Gordon Inlet Rd as 4WD track to inlet.	5	No	The best provision of access to Gordon Inlet, the Peninsula and links with Bremer Bay will be assessed with the Shire of Jerramungup.	2(b)
2	Shire will seek to arrange a joint road maintenance program for Gordon Inlet Rd.	1	Yes, p. 86	Amend plan.	1(a,c)
3	Upgrade one of the 4WD tracks from Gordon Inlet Rd to Peninsular area.	1	No	Covered in Table 14.	2(c)
4	Should not close Gordon Inlet Road after rain.	1	No	Refer to 9.1 Disease.	2(c)
	Gairdner Road North Proposed Management: Assess need for realignment. Stabilise Crossing. *1 submission.*				
1	Recommend caution and restraint when stabilising crossing of Gairdner River.	1	No	No change sought.	2(c)
	Gairdner Road South Proposed Management: Assess need for realignment. Sheet where necessary. *2 submissions.*				
1	Upgrade to 2WD all weather road.	2	No	See Comment 1, Gordon Inlet Rd.	2(c)
	Cheadanup Cliffs Track Existing Management: Closed to vehicles, used as walk trail. *11 submissions.*				
1	Recommend re-opening track to 2WD's with terminal carpark.	8	Yes, p. 86	Clarify use of names. Track is to remain closed to vehicles.	1(e)
2	Oppose closure of Cheadanup track.	3	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	Trigelow Beach Track Proposed Management: Maintain 4WD access to beach. *3 submissions.*				
1	Support retention of 4WD access.	2	Yes, p. 86	Clarify use of names.	1(e)
2	Re-open old access track to eastern end of beach.	2	No	This is provided for.	2(c)
3	Track needs to be stabilised in places.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(c)
	Trigelow Beach Proposed Management: Continue beach access, monitor. *8 submissions.*				
1	Support retention of 4WD access.	5	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Close beach to 4WD's.	3	No	Aim is to provide a range of recreational opportunities. Some beaches are closed to 4WD vehicles.	2(d)
	Small Boondalup Track Proposed Management: Close to vehicles, use as walktrail. *2 submissions.*				
1	Disagree with closure to vehicles.	2	No	See Comment 1, General Comments sub-section.	2(c)
2	Support closure of track.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	St Mary's Track Proposed Management: Realign, upgrade to 2WD all weather. Provide stable access to Pt Charles Bay Beach. *2 submissions.*				
1	Opposed to upgrading - retain as 4WD track.	2	No	St Mary's will cater for 2WD vehicle-based campers as an alternative to Point Ann which is to become day-use only.	2(c)
	St Mary's - Pt Charles Track Proposed Management: Close overland tracks, keep beach open. *11 submissions.*				
1	Recommend realignment of overland track.	8	Yes, p. 86	Amend plan. Realign track on hinterland.	1(a)
2	Confusion regarding access track entering Lake Nameless catchment.	4	Yes, p. 86	Amend plan.	1(a)
3	Upgrade track to sand bar.	1	No	Campsite at Pt Charles and track to sand bar is to be closed.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	Pt Charles Bay Beach Proposed Management: Continue beach access, monitor. *18 submissions.*				
1	Request entire beach be retained for 4WD use.	14	Yes, p. 86	Amend plan. Provide for access along whole beach.	1(a)
2	Support retention of 4WD access.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Close beach to 4WD's.	3	No	Aim is to provide a range of recreational opportunities.	2(c)
	Fitzgerald Inlet Track Proposed Management: Assess need for realignment. Sheet where necessary. *8 submissions.*				
1	Retain 4WD access to Fitzgerald Inlet.	6	No	This is already provided for.	2(a,c)
2	Upgrade Fitzgerald Inlet track to 2WD all weather.	2	No	Aim is to provide a range of recreational opportunities.	2(c)
	Fitzgerald Beach Proposed Management: Continue beach access, monitor. *18 submissions.*				
1	Retain 4WD beach access along Fitzgerald Beach.	14	No	This is already provided for.	2(a,c)
2	Disagree with 4WD access on beach.	4	No	Protection of nesting Dotterels is provided for.	2(c)
3	Close Dempster end of Fitzgerald Beach.	2	No	Closure in plan refers to campsite only , not beach.	2(c)
	CENTRAL SECTION Telegraph Track (between Fitzgerald Inlet and Marshes Beach turn-off), Drummond Track, Twin Bays Track, the southern half of Bell Track, the fireline between Red Peak and Mt Drummond, and Fitzgerald South Track will not be accessed prior to 1995, except in a life-threatening emergency. There will be a major review of fire access in this area in 1995. Telegraph Track (between Marshes Beach and Quoin Head turn-offs) and the Marshes Beach / Red Islet tracks will remain management-only tracks for the duration of the plan.				

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	Drummond Track Proposed Management: Close. *17 submissions.*				
1	Request that Drummond Track be re-opened.	12	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(c)
2	Drummond Track is required for (fire) emergency access.	12	Yes, p. 86	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	1(a)
3	Should re-route track around dieback infection.	4	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c)
	Bell Track Proposed Management: Keep closed. *2 submissions.*				
1	Bell Track should be maintained for emergency access.	5	Yes, p. 86	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	1(a)
2	Bell Track should remain closed.	2	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire. The northern half of Bell Track will remain closed.	2(c)
	Telegraph Track Proposed Management: Close from Fitzgerald Inlet Track to Quoin Head Track. *34 submissions.*				
1	Telegraph Track is required for (fire) emergency access.	8	Yes, p. 86	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	1(a,b)
2	Telegraph Track should remain open from Hamersley Drive to the McGlinn's turn-off.	7	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c,d)
3	Telegraph Track should provide an east-west link across the Park.	7	No	Contradicts departmental policies.	2(b,d)
4	Support current proposal - close between Quoin Head Track and Fitzgerald Inlet (Option 2).	7	Yes, p. 86	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	1(a,b)
5	Support closure of Telegraph Track from Hamersley Drive to Fitzgerald Inlet (Option 1).	4	Yes, p. 86	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	1(a,b)
6	Support closure of Telegraph Track.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
7	Telegraph Track should be upgraded to 2WD all weather standard.	4	No	Contradicts departmental policies.	2(b,c)
8	Re-open Telegraph Track as a 4WD track.	1	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b)
9	Close Telgraph Track west of Marshes turn-off.	1	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
10	If Telegraph Track is opened up to Marshes turn-off then no further westward extension.	1	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(c)
	McGlinns (Twin Bay) Track Proposed Management: Close. *11 submissions.*				
1	McGlinns track should be re-opened.	11	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(c)
2	Re-route access track to avoid Dempster catchment.	3	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c)
3	Some re-alignment may be necessary to avoid erosion.	2	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(c)
4	Alternative access is via the Blue Hole to east end of McGlinns.	2	No	Refer to 14.0 Recreation Sites.	2(c)
	Two Bump Hill Track Proposed Management: Close. *8 submissions.*				
1	Re-open Two Bump Hill Track.	8	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(c)
2	Realign track around Two Bump Hill.	3	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(c)
3	Close track over Two Bump Hill to vehicles - leave for walkers.	2	No	This is provided for in plan.	2(c)
4	Realign track if it enters the Dempster catchment.	1	No	Track is not near catchment.	2(c)
	Marshes Beach Track Proposed Management: Close. *8 submissions.*				
1	Re-open access to Marshes Beach.	7	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c)
2	Realign track if it enters the Dempster catchment.	1	No	Track is not near catchment.	2(c)
3	Restrict access west of Marshes Beach turn-off.	1	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(c)
	RRWM Channel Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *2 submissions.*				
1	Re-open access but do not upgrade.	2	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	The Slide Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *2 submissions.*				
1	Re-open access. Some realignment may be necessary.	2	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c)
	Fred's Lagoon Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *3 submissions.*				
1	Re-open access. Some realignment may be necessary.	3	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c)
	Rod's Lagoon Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *2 submissions.*				
1	Re-open access.	2	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c)
	Pebble Beach Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *3 submissions.*				
1	Re-open access but do not upgrade.	3	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c)
	The Ledge Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *2 submissions.*				
1	Re-open access.	2	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c)
	The Blue Hole Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *2 submissions.*				
1	Re-open access.	2	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c)
	Crab Cliff Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *2 submissions.*				
1	Re-open access.	2	No	See Introduction, this sub-section and refer to 9.2 Fire.	2(b,c)
	NOTE: All submissions that advocated Telegraph Track be opened from Hamersley Drive to the McGlinns turn-off, or that Drummond Track be re-opened also support the re-opening of access to sites between Quoin Head and McGlinns (14 submissions). Similarly, all submissions that supported the closure of Telegraph Track, either along its entire length or between Quoin Head and Fitzgerald Inlet, also support the closure of sites between Quoin Head and Fitzgerald Inlet (13 submissions).				

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	EASTERN SECTION				
	Quoin Head Track Proposed Management: Assess need for realignment. Sheet where necessary. *10 submissions.*				
1	If Quoin Head closed to camping, then increased vehicle traffic will result in increased erosion of track.	7	No	Refer to 14.0 Recreation Sites.	2(c)
2	Drainage needs to be improved by filling in spoon drains.	2	No	Track will be sheeted where necessary.	2(c)
3	Realign bad section of track.	1	No	The need for realignment will be assessed.	2(c)
4	Upgrade to 2WD all-weather.	1	No	Aim is to provide a range of recreation opportunities.	2(c)
5	Should stop access at top of cliffs.	1	No	See Comments 2 and 3, this sub-section.	2(c)
6	Track should be left as it is.	1	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(c)
7	Track should be closed.	1	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(c)
	Whalebone Track (from Quoin Head) Proposed Management: Assess need for realignment. Sheet where necessary. *5 submissions.*				
1	Retain as 4WD access to form ring road with W. Hamersley Inlet track.	4	Yes, p. 85	Track will be closed as alternative access is available.	1(a)
2	Minimal upgrading needed.	2	Yes, p. 85	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a)
3	Close access track to Quoin Head.	1	Yes, p. 85	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a)
	Dave Niels Track (from W. Hamersley Inlet) Proposed Management: Close, provide alternative access via Quoin Head. *5 submissions.*				
1	Retain as 4WD access to form ring road with W. Hamersley Inlet track.	5	Yes, p. 85	Track will remain open and be sheeted where necessary.	1(e)
	West Hamersley Inlet Track Proposed Management: Close. *6 submissions.*				
1	Retain as 4WD access.	5	Yes, p. 85	Track will remain open and be sheeted where necessary.	1(a)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
2	Block off 'slide' down to Inlet and rehabilitate.	3	Yes, p. 85	The 'slide' to Hamersley Inlet will be blocked off.	1(a)
3	Minimal upgrading needed.	2	Yes, p. 85	The track will be sheeted where necessary.	1(a)
	Driftwood Beach Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP *1 submission.*				
1	Retain 4WD access.	1	Yes, p. 85	Access is available from Whalebone Track.	1(b)
	Edwards Point Track Proposed Management: Monitor. *3 submissions.*				
1	Retain current access track.	2	No	Track will be retained.	2(c)
2	Old road to Edwards Pt. from Hamersley Inlet Road must be closed.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
3	Would like new road to Edwards Pt to start from road into West Beach.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
	Shark Hole and Tommy Daws Channel Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *2 submissions.*				
1	These tracks should remain open.	2	Yes, p. 85	Tracks will remain open.	1(b)
	Hamersley Dunes Track Proposed Management: Monitor *6 submissions.*				
1	Retain 4WD access over dunes to beach.	3	Yes, p. 85	Access across dunes will be retained along a defined corridor.	1(a,b)
2	Recommend strict control of access to dunes.	1	Yes, p. 85	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(a)
3	Should ban 4WD's and bikes from dune systems.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(b)
4	Open up to dune buggies, bikes etc.	1	No	Contradicts departmental policies.	2(b)
	Hamersley Inlet Road Proposed Management: Maintain. *2 submissions.*				
1	Oppose proposed Shire road from Hamersley Inlet to coast.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
2	Develop track from Shire camp to beach along inlet.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	The Gorge Track (Little Beach Track) Proposed Management: Close to vehicles, use as walktrail, provide carpark at head of track. *2 submissions.*				
1	Support recommendation.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	West Beach Point (Cave Point) Proposed Management: Close spur to Point, provide walktrail to West Beach Point. *3 submissions.*				
1	Re-open track to Cave Pt for viewing.	3	Yes, p. 85	Footpath will be maintained and improved, disabled access will be investigated. Editorial change re. spur.	1(e)
	Moir Track Proposed Management: Assess need for realignment. Sheet where necessary. *6 submissions.*				
1	Improve drainage by filling in/removing spoon drains.	3	No	Maintenance is ongoing.	2(c)
2	Upgrading of track should be a priority.	3	No	Track will be sheeted where necessary.	2(c)
3	Upgrade to all-weather 2WD road.	2	No	Track will be sheeted where necessary.	2(c)
	Mylies Road Proposed Management: Maintain. *2 submissions.*				
1	Re-open track to west end of Mylies for beach access and day use.	1	No	Contradicts departmental policies.	2(b,d)
2	Leave access as is.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	Hamersley Drive Proposed Management: Assess need for realignment. Provide "pull overs" with interpretive material. *6 submissions.*				
1	Inconsistent to stop usage of East Mt Barren footpath but continue to allow vehicles to pass through dieback infection.	3	Yes, p. 85	Aim is to seal the road, investigate re-opening the path and to interpret dieback at the site. Refer to Access sub-section, 9.1 Disease.	1(a)
2	Support relocation of beginning of path and realignment of walktrail.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Upgrade whole road to MRD standard with direction on H'way 1.	1	No	Action is proposed.	2(c)
4	Establish sealed carpark on old gravel pit site: provide stable walkway to first stage on path.	1	Yes, p. 85	Action is proposed.	1(d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	Southern Ocean West Road Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *4 submissions.*				
1	Flood damage from Culham Inlet requires urgent solution.	4	No	Problem has been addressed.	2(b)
	13.1 TELEGRAPH TRACK *34 submissions.* Refer to 13.0 Access, Central Section, for discussion on Telegraph Track.				
	14.0 RECREATION SITES **14.1 General** All comments on particular recreation sites have been considered in conjunction with the comments relating to access (13.0 Access). The term "overnight resting in vehicles" is defined as sleeping in, or next to a vehicle for one night provided that neither tents nor any other external structure is erected. Overnight resting in vehicles will be permitted on 4WD beaches and at some 4WD sites.				
	General Comments				
1	The plan denies access to traditional recreation areas.	32	No	Refer to 13.0 Access for details on individual tracks.	2(c)
2	Campsites outside the Park (Starvation Bay and Mason Bay) suffer from overuse due to Park policy.	13	No	A 100% increase in camping in FRNP is proposed over next 10 years and should reduce pressure in areas outside the Park. Technical advice is usually available from CALM to assist in management of campsites outside the Park.	2(c)
3	Support for pre-booking of campsites.	5	Yes, p. 92	Amend Recommendation 7.	1(d)
4	Support for establishment of generator areas.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
5	Camping adjacent to the beach is possible with good planning and stabilising of the coastal dune environment.	2	No	This is acknowledged.	2(c)
6	Support for recommendations.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
7	Should consider banning generators from campsites.	1	No	May need to designate generator-only areas if conflict arises.	2(c)
8	Disused gravel pits should be rehabilitated into campsites.	1	Yes, p. 93	Disused gravel pits will be inspected for their suitability as camp-sites if needed.	1(d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
9	Shire will implement local management plan for Doubtful Island Peninsula and facilities for campers.	1	No	No change sought.	2(c)
10	The Coastal Management Branch of S.P.C may be able to assist with development close to beach areas.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(c)
11	The claim that number of campsites has been increased needs more scrutiny.	1	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(c)
12	East end of Park (Four Mile - West Beach) should cater for total tourist population.	1	No	Plan aims to cater for equitable use by all visitors.	2(c,d)
13	Condition preventing overnight camping to commercial fishermen is totally unreasonable and unnecessary.	1	Yes, p. 93	The needs of commercial fishermen will be considered in the future development of any campsites near inlets.	1(b)
14	Campsites should be within easy access to popular spots.	1	No	This has been considered.	2(c)
15	Remove the statement "a camping area will not be changed to day use until an attractive alternative camping area has been established."	1	No	This is an integral part of the proposed Strategy to ensure practical management.	2(c)
16	Include a statement about the prohibition of squatters shacks in line with S.P.C. draft policy.	1	No	Not considered necessary.	2(c)
17	Recommendation 1 (p.106) should state "Site development plans must be prepared..."	1	Yes, p. 92	Reword Recommendation 1 accordingly.	1(e)
18	Table 16 is too specific - proposals may change over 10 years.	1	Yes, p. 93	Delete "Current" from Table 16.	1(e)
19	Recommendations 14, 15 and 16 (specific sites) are too specific.	1	Yes, p. 93	Reword recommendations accordingly.	1(d)
20	Include 'school holidays' with peak periods mentioned on p.93.	1	Yes, p. 90	Add "school holidays" to text.	1(a)
21	Replace '20cm' with '10cm' in Recommendation 19, p.108.	1	Yes, p. 93	Amend Recommendation 19 accordingly.	1(e)
22	Delete last line of Recommendation 5, p.106.	1	Yes, p. 92	Amend Recommendation 5 accordingly.	1(e)
23	Distinguish sites where unregulated use is causing problems: • decide which proposed changes would be necessary if sites were regulated • use local people in site management by: implementing 'site host' system, or giving responsibility of site to permit holders.	1	Yes, p. 93	Sensitive sites have been given high monitoring priority. A booking system will be implemented as necessary for campsites, and a site host system is being considered.	1(d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	Group Camping *4 submissions.*				
1	Proposed club campsite near Kybulup Pool should be relocated to north side of pool to avoid conflict with apiary site.	1	No	Apiary site has been removed.	2(c)
2	Club or group camping should be catered for outside the Park.	1	No	Aim is to provide recreation opportunities for a range of Park users.	2(b)
3	Commend concept of group camping.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
4	Maringerup homestead is a possible site for group camping.	1	Yes, p. 106	Include statement in plan.	1(a)
	Alternative Inland Sites *19 submissions.*				
1	Opposed to changing coastal sites to inland venues.	9	Yes, .p 96	These comments were mainly directed at the proposal to change Quoin Head to day-use only and provide for camping at Hamersley River crossing. The plan has been amended to allow continued camping at Quoin Head, restricted where necessary, in addition to camping at Hamersley River crossing.	1(b)
2	Change to an inland venue will result in increased vehicle traffic and increased erosion.	7	Yes, p. 96	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(b)
3	Support for provision of alternative inland campsites.	3	No	No change sought.	2(a)
4	Family camping will be severely curtailed.	2	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
5	Hamersley Crossing site could be used for overflow during peak periods.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(c)
6	Inland campsites pose a greater fire risk than coastal sites.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(c)
7	A campsite in Copper Mine Creek area should be investigated.	1	No	Locations of sites are correlated to available access.	2(c)
8	Calyerup Rocks should be encouraged for camping.	1	No	This area is proposed to be added to the Park (see 3.0 Land Tenure).	2(b,c)
9	There is a possible campsite on other side of Twertup Creek.	1	No	See Comment 7, this sub-section.	2(b,c)
	WESTERN SECTION **Trigelow Beach** Proposed Management: Close campsite and rehabilitate. Close track. *2 submissions.*				
1	Oppose the closure of campsite.	2	No	Site is little used and susceptible to wind erosion.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
2	Site should be stabilised if necessary.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
	Small Boondalup River Proposed Management: Close to vehicles. Promote as backpack site. Provide carpark and trailhead on Trigelow Beach track. *2 submissions.*				
1	Support closure to overnight camping.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Retain vehicle access for day use area.	1	No	Site is little used and susceptible to wind erosion.	2(c)
	Point Ann Proposed Management: Re-design for day use only. *19 submissions. (Refer also to 15.6 Boating)*				
1	Opposed to closure of site for camping.	9	No	Camping in this area will be catered for nearby at St Mary's.	2(c)
2	Shack should remain and be maintained in its present condition.	6	No	It is proposed to convert shack into a day use facility.	2(c)
3	Upgrade/stabilise campsite (with gravel or limestone).	3	No	Upgrading will be considered in the site development plan.	2(c)
4	Develop carpark suitably gravelled for boat-trailer use.	3	Yes, p. 94	Provision for boat trailers will be considered in site development plan.	1(b)
5	Support proposal for day use only.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
6	Develop shack as an information area (on Rabbit Proof Fence etc).	1	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(c)
7	Shack should be removed.	1	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(d)
8	Urgent planning and design needed to protect the area.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(c)
9	Pt. Ann should be assessed for camping and day use.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
	St. Marys Proposed Management: Provide camping (max. design load 10). Provide toilets and beach access for boat launching. *5 submissions (Refer also to 15.6 Boating)*				
1	Support proposed camping area.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	St. Marys not large enough to cater for increasing demand.	1	No	Future demand will be considered in site development plan.	2(c)
3	Good opportunity for camping in stable mallee area inland from beach.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	Point Charles Proposed Management: Close campsite and rehabilitate. *3 submissions.*				
1	Pt. Charles beach is a most enjoyable area for camping.	1	No	Overnight resting in vehicles will be permitted on 4WD beaches and at some 4WD destinations.	2(a)
2	Closure of the north-east end will affect a lot of fishermen who like to camp up near the Point.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
3	The top of Pt Charles should be left open.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
	Fitzgerald Beach (East End) Proposed Management: Close to vehicles, promote as backpack site. *3 submissions.*				
1	Oppose closure of vehicle-based campsite.	3	No	Overnight resting in vehicles will be permitted on 4WD beaches.	2(c)
2	Alternative campsite at back of dunes should be investigated.	2	No	This has been considered.	2(c)
3	Degradation of site is overstated in DMP.	2	No	Site is potentially unstable if further damage to melaleucas occurs.	2(c)
	Fitzgerald Inlet Proposed Management: Provide camping (max. design load 15). Provide toilets. Ensure 4WD access to beach. *4 submissions.*				
1	Fitzgerald Inlet campsite is excellent.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Quicksand area should be clearly signposted.	2	No	Refer to 16.0 Information, Interpretation and Education.	2(c)
3	Fitzgerald Inlet is a most enjoyable area for camping.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	Twertup Proposed Management: Assess future requirements by consultation between CALM and FRNPA. *3 submissions.*				
1	Commend the present maintenance of Twertup.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	There is a possible campsite on other side of Twertup Creek.	1	No	Locations of sites are correlated with available access.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	Gordon Inlet Proposed Management: Develop for vehicle-based camping (max. design load 5). Provide toilets. *2 submissions.*				
1	Council shall provide facilities for camping at the 'Paperbarks' at the mouth of the Gordon Inlet.	1	No	The area referred to as 'The Paperbarks' in the plan is a different site to the one mentioned here. Technical advice is usually available from CALM to assist in management of these areas.	2(a)
2	Gordon Inlet site is not an appropriate camping site.	1	No	Propose to develop site for vehicle-based camping.	2(c)
	The Peninsula Proposed Management: Develop for vehicle-based camping. *1 submission.*				
1	CALM are to provide sufficient camping facilities for professional fishermen on the Peninsular on the Gairdner River.	1	No	Refer to 10.2 Commercial Fishing.	2(a)
	CENTRAL SECTION				
	McGlinns (Twin Bays) Proposed Management: Monitor for impacts by backpack campers. *11 submissions.*				
1	Re-open McGlinns for vehicle-based camping.	11	No	McGlinns will be available for backpack camping only and subject to dieback control measures.	2(c)
2	Campsite should serve limited number of campers.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
	Marshes Beach Proposed Management: Monitor for impacts by backpack campers. *7 submissions.*				
1	Re-open for vehicle-based camping and day use.	7	No	Marshes Beach and sites in the Red Islet area (west to Twin Bays) will be available for backpack camping only. Access to these sites is subject to dieback hygiene measures (refer to 9.1 Disease).	2(b,c,d)
2	Sites such as Marshes should serve a limited number of campers.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
	Fred's Lagoon Proposed Management: Monitor for impacts by backpack campers. *3 submissions.*				
1	Retain for limited vehicle-based camping.	3	No	See Comment 1, Marshes Beach.	2(b,c,d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	Rod's Lagoon Proposed Management: Monitor for impacts by backpack campers. *2 submissions.*				
1	Retain for limited vehicle-based camping.	2	No	See Comment 1, Marshes Beach.	2(b,c,d)
	R.R.W.M. Channel Proposed Management: Monitor for impacts by backpack campers. *2 submissions.*				
1	Retain for limited vehicle-based camping.	2	No	See Comment 1, Marshes Beach.	2(b,c,d)
	The Slide Proposed Management: Monitor for impacts by backpack campers. *2 submissions.*				
1	Retain for overnight vehicle-based camping.	2	No	See Comment 1, Marshes Beach.	2(b,c,d)
	Pebble Beach Headland Proposed Management: Monitor for impacts by backpack campers. *3 submissions.*				
1	Retain for limited vehicle-based camping.	3	No	See Comment 1, Marshes Beach.	2(b,c,d)
	The Ledge Proposed Management: Monitor for impacts by backpack campers. *2 submissions.*				
1	Retain for overnight vehicle-based camping.	2	No	See Comment 1, Marshes Beach.	2(b,c,d)
	The Blue Hole Proposed Management: Monitor for impacts by backpack campers. *2 submissions.*				
1	Retain for overnight vehicle-based camping.	2	No	See Comment 1, Marshes Beach.	2(b,c,d)
	EASTERN SECTION				
	Quoin Head Proposed Management: Redesign for day use only. Provide toilets. Rehabilitate degraded and eroding areas. *27 submissions.*				
1	Opposed to closure of Quoin Head for camping.	20	Yes, p. 96	Camping will be allowed at Quoin Head and restricted where necessary. Monitoring of this site will be a high priority.	1(b)
2	Stabilise/upgrade campsite with gravel.	14	No	Upgrading will be considered in the site development plan.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
3	Shelter and shade trees should be planted.	4	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(c)
4	Campsite should serve limited number of campers.	2	Yes, p. 96	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(b)
5	A pathway down to the beach should be installed.	1	No	See Comment 2, this sub-section.	2(c)
6	Support closure to vehicle-based camping.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
7	Possible campsite on flat to west of inlet could be used for walkers.	1	No	This will be addressed in site development plan.	2(c)
8	Should begin rehabilitation without closing site to campers.	1	Yes, p. 96	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(b)
	Whalebone Beach Proposed Management: Provide access via Quoin Head and close existing access from north.. Day use only. *6 submissions*				
1	Re-open site for limited vehicle-based camping.	4	Yes, p. 96	Site will remain closed to camping but possible new campsites in the Whalebone area will be investigated.	1(e)
2	Site should be upgraded with gravel or limestone.	2	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
3	Road between Quoin Head and W. Hamersley provides further three camping areas.	1	Yes, p. 96	See Comment 1, this sub-section and refer to 13.0 Access.	1(b)
	Dave Niels Channel Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *1 submission.*				
1	Limited camping is available.	1	No	Possible new campsites in the Whalebone area will be investigated. Overnight resting in vehicles will be permitted at some 4WD sites.	2(c)
	Driftwood Beach Proposed Management: Not referred to in DMP. *2 submissions.*				
1	Overnight camping should be retained.	1	No	Overnight resting in vehicles will be permitted on 4WD beaches and at some 4WD sites.	2(c)
2	Allows a short walk to the Quad Hole for fishing.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	West Hamersley Inlet Proposed Management: Close and rehabilitate. *6 submissions.*				
1	Retain 4WD access and vehicle-based camping.	4	No	Site will be closed to all vehicle access.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
2	Block off 'the slide' down to inlet and rehabilitate.	3	Yes, p. 96	Close off the 'slide' down to inlet.	1(a)
3	Upgrade site with gravel or limestone.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
4	Should retain site for day use.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
	Hamersley Dunes Proposed Management: Develop nearby mallees for vehicle-based camping (max. design load 6). *4 submissions.*				
1	Campsite should be retained and enlarged if possible.	3	No	A new campsite is proposed in addition to the existing one.	2(c)
2	Access across dunes should be retained.	3	Yes, p. 96	Access will be along a defined corridor.	1(b)
3	Open dunes up to buggies and bikes.	1	No	Contradicts departmental policies.	2(b)
4	The proposed campsite is not required.	1	No	Mobile dunes are encroaching on original site.	2(c)
	Hamersley Inlet Proposed Management: Encourage Shire to develop campsite (max. design load 20) and day use area on Shire reserve with boat launching access, toilets and gas BBQ's. Close and rehabilitate existing site. *5 submissions.*				
1	Re-open old campsite at top of inlet.	2	Yes, p. 96	Re-open old campsite for vehicle-based camping.	1(b)
2	Disused access track could be developed into walk trail and lookout.	1	No	Works adjacent to Inlet need to be based on liaison between CALM and Shire of Ravensthorpe.	2(b,c)
3	Support for recommendation.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
4	Council will establish this area as a camping site for its reserve users not as a cost saving device for the Park.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	Edwards Point Proposed Management: Close and rehabilitate campsite. Monitor track and turn around on Point. *5 submissions.*				
1	Retain for vehicle-based camping.	5	No	Overnight resting in vehicles will be permitted at some 4WD sites.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	West Beach Proposed Management: Redesign to create one-way loop. Repair steps to beach. Provide toilets. *6 submissions.*				
1	Re-open original site for vehicle-based camping.	4	No	Site will remain a day use area only.	2(c)
2	Upgrade site with gravel or limestone.	2	No	Upgrading will be considered in the site development plan.	2(c)
3	Develop a second site for day use only.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
4	Support for recommendation.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	West Beach Point (Cave Point) Refer to 13.0 Access.				
	Little Beach (The Gorge) Proposed Management: Close to vehicles, rehabilitate access track. Provide for backpack campers. *2 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendation.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	East Mylies Proposed Management: Reduce road crest, use cut to fill carpark. Monitor existing walkway for erosion. Remove sections of abandoned walkway. *2 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendation.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Retain for day use.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	Mylies Beach Proposed Management: Redesign for day use only, based on site 200 m west of existing site. Provide toilets, tables. Retain existing carpark for peak periods. *21 submissions.*				
1	Opposed to closure of Mylies for camping.	18	No	Site was severely damaged by 1988 flood and 1989 fires. Conflicts between users and its limited capacity are also concerns.	2(c)
2	Campsite should be stabilised/upgraded with gravel.	7	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
3	Shelter and shade trees should be planted.	2	No	This will be considered in the site development plan.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
4	New site to the west should be day use only.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	East Mt Barren Trailhead Proposed Management: Move trailhead and parking area. Realign trail due to dieback risk. *5 submissions. (Refer also to 9.1 Disease).*				
1	Support closure of the trailhead.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Oppose the establishment of another walk trail.	1	No	Aim is to realign existing trail.	2(c)
3	Oppose closure of the existing walk trail.	1	Yes, p. 95	A sealed carpark will be established on the old gravel pit site and a stable walkway provided to the first stage of the path.	1(a)
	East Mt Barren Lookout Proposed Management: Reconstruct parking area. Replace rails with unpainted bollards. Upgrade trail and provide signs at lookout. *1 submission.*				
1	Support for recommendation.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
	Four Mile/Barrens Beach Proposed Management: Assess need to increase carpark capacity and camping capacity (Four Mile). Redesign Barrens Beach carpark. *4 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Commend the Four Mile campsite.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Disagree that there is no parking pattern at Barrens Beach.	1	Yes, p. 95	Remove statement re parking pattern.	1(e)
	14.2 Recreation Site Management (Level of development, campfires, caravans and rubbish).				
	Campfires *41 submissions.*				
1	People do/should bring in their own wood.	24	Yes, p. 97	Fires in containers that meet with the ranger's approval will be allowed on beaches and in approved campsites provided a live fire is not left unattended and own fuel is supplied that is free of dirt and seeds.	1(b)
2	Fires contained in drums should be allowed.	13	Yes, p. 97	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
3	Oppose the prohibition of ground (camp) fires on beaches.	10	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
4	The social aspect of woodfire on a cold night is overlooked in DMP.	8	Yes, p. 97	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(b)
5	Fire wood should be supplied by CALM.	7	No	Limited resources could be better used elsewhere.	2(c)
6	Fire places should be provided at most sites.	4	No	Gas barbecues will be provided at the more intensively used areas.	2(c)
7	Support the banning of open campfires.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
8	Increased risk of introducing weeds and dieback from wood brought in from outside the Park.	2	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
9	No risk of dieback and weed introduction as heat of fire destroys disease.	2	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
10	Firewood could come from the Cocanarup Timber Reserve.	1	No	See Comments 1 and 5, this sub-section.	2(c)
11	Wood supplies should be negotiated from local properties.	1	No	See Comments 1 and 5, this sub-section.	2(c)
12	Problem of lack of waste firewood could be overcome for less cost than some of the suggestions made.	1	No	See Comments 1 and 5, this sub-section.	2(c)
13	Unemployed and pensioners could be employed to bring in wood and take rubbish out.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(c)
14	Penalties should be imposed on people damaging trees for fire wood.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
15	Removal of deadwood by backpackers is infinitesimal compared with prescribed fires.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(c)
16	The only sites where campfires should be allowed are 4WD destination sites.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(c)
17	Sites should be monitored for adverse impacts due to wood gathering.	1	No	This is provided for. Refer to 14.1 Recreation Sites, General.	2(c)
18	Due to the concern about ground fires, we will add words to that effect to our Code of Ethics.	1	No	No change sought. This action is appreciated.	2(a)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	Rubbish Bins *6 submissions.*				
1	Two or three bins should be placed around campsites.	2	No	Provision of bins is to be rationalised as far as possible to ensure the best use of available resources.	2(c)
2	Unemployed and pensioners could be employed to take rubbish out.	1	No	Aim is to encourage visitors to "pack it in, pack it out".	2(c)
3	People should be fined for not removing their litter.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
4	A "dump" type rubbish bin should be supplied at each site.	1	No	Covered in Recommendation 4.	2(c)
5	People are unlikely to take rubbish all the way home.	1	No	Bulk rubbish collection sites will be provided close to Park exits.	2(c)
	Barbecues *12 submissions.*				
1	BBQ facilities should be supplied.	4	Yes, p. 97	Gas barbecues will be provided at the more intensely used areas.	1(b)
2	At least one gas barbecue should be provided at all camping and day use sites.	4	Yes, p. 97	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(b)
3	Gas barbecues should be installed at Four Mile and Barrens Beach.	2	Yes, p. 97	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	1(b)
4	Electric barbecues should be considered.	1	No	Gas barbecues are considered more practical.	2(c)
5	Commend installation of gas barbecue at Point Ann.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
6	Wood barbecues are detrimental to the ecology that surrounds camping areas.	1	No	See Comment 1, this sub-section.	2(a)
	Toilets *2 submissions.*				
1	Support the construction of more toilet blocks in the Park.	1	Yes, p. 98	Amend Recommendation 3.	1(b)
2	Single pan toilets could be provided at the more remote sites.	1	No	Toilets will be provided at campsites as required.	2(a)
	Caravans *5 submissions.*				
1	Caravans should not be catered for in the Park.	3	No	Covered in Strategy.	2(c)
2	Caravan/camping facilities could be established at south end entrance to the Park.	1	No	Four caravan parks already abut the Park.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
3	Caravan facilities could be established on Phillips River at Moir Track entrance to the Park.	1	No	Four caravan parks already abut the Park.	2(c)
	Generators *3 submissions.*				
1	Support the provision of generator areas.	2	No	No change sought.	2(c)
2	Oppose the provision of generator areas.	1	No	Plan provides for the designation of generator-only areas if conflict arises.	2(c)
	Post and Rail Fencing *1 submission.*				
1	Big rocks could be utilised instead of post and rail fencing.	1	Yes, p. 98	Amend Recommendation 7.	1(e)
	15.0 RECREATION ACTIVITIES **15.1 Nature Study** *2 submissions.*				
1	Support for objective and recommendation.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Erect small information plaques at points of interest and lookouts.	1	No	Refer to 16.0 Information, Interpretation and Education.	2(c)
3	Upgrade information available at Park information bays.	1	No	This is provided for. Refer to 16.0 Information, Interpretation and Education.	2(a)
	15.2 Sightseeing *5 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Should include the provision of walktrails associated with pull-overs in Recommendation 1.	1	No	Refer to 15.3 Bushwalking.	2(c)
3	The Old Ongerup Road is unlikely to receive further upgrading.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(a,b)
4	Recommendation 3 should be of a low priority.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(c)
	15.3 Bushwalking *17 submissions (Refer also to 9.1 Disease and 13.0 Access)*				
1	Support the pedestrian closure to central peaks.	3	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	The coastal walk should be a track, not a route.	3	No	Aim is to retain the coastal walk as a route.	2(c)
3	Support Recommendation 6, p.114 ie. 'stoves only' for walkers.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
4	Contradiction in positioning of trails to provide views and also restrict the spread of dieback.	2	No	Aim is to provide views where possible subject to the over-riding priority of restricting dieback spread.	2(c)
5	Support a range of walktrails in the Park.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
6	Support for recommendations.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
7	The coastal walk should be well signposted.	1	No	Covered in Recommendation 9.	2(c)
8	Paragraph on coastal walk (p.112) should indicate the lack of paths in some sections.	1	Yes, p. 100	Add information for clarity.	1(e)
9	Extended walks of several days duration need to diverge close to management tracks at certain points for safety and management reasons.	1	No	This will be provided for where possible in the implementation phase.	2(c)
10	All walks should have brochures but those for the adventurous could be interpretive only.	1	Yes, p. 102	Amend Recommendation 7.	1(e)
11	Walkers should be restricted from central coastal area until dieback status has been established.	1	No	Refer to 9.1 Disease. Access for walkers is subject to dieback hygiene measures and will be restricted where as necessary.	2(c)
12	It would be more attractive to walkers if some fresh water was available.	1	No	Freshwater is a very limited resource in the Park.	2(c)
13	The water tank at Twin Bay should be maintained.	1	Yes, p. 102	Clarify in plan: The water tank at Twin Bays will be retained.	1(b,d)
14	Unfair for walkers to carry cooking fuel, stoves and fresh water.	1	No	This is acknowledged but is practice for minimum-impact bushwalkin	2(c)
15	Some walkers may cause damage by seeking vantage points.	1	No	See Comment 4, this section.	2(c)
16	Good detailed map is important for walkers.	1	No	Refer to 16.0 Information, Interpretation and Education.	2(c)
17	The disused track from Hamersley Inlet to coast could be developed as a walk trail and lookout facility.	1	No	Any works near Inlet requires liaison between CALM and Shire of Ravensthorpe.	2(b)
18	Opposed to re-routed walk trail up East Mt Barren.	1	No	A sealed carpark will be established on the old gravel pit site and a stable walkway provided to the first stage of the path.	2(c)
19	Climbing of Roe's Rock should not be permitted.	1	No	Site will be monitored and management action taken as necessary.	2(c)
20	CALM should conduct education programs on dieback for walkers.	1	No	Educational talks by CALM officers have been aimed at Bushwalking Clubs in the past. Individual walkers are covered in Rec. 3.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
21	Perhaps foot access should not be allowed within the Wilderness Zone.	1	No	See Comment 4, 5.0 Management Zones. Foot access will be restricted as necessary.	2(c)
22	The term 'path' should replace 'walk' in this section.	1	No	The term 'path' has been used to replace 'trail'.	2(c)
23	No new walk trails should be introduced.	1	No	Objective is to provide a variety of bushwalking opportunities.	2(c)
24	There is little opportunity for the inexperienced overnight walker.	1	No	See Comment 23, this section.	2(c)
25	Interesting flora could be tagged with identification labels.	1	No	Refer to 16.0 Information, Interpretation and Education.	2(c)
26	Information in Recommendation 4 should be placed on brochures to minimise number of signs.	1	Yes, p. 101	Amend Recommendation 4.	1(e)
27	Recommendation 5, p.113, should specify where to place signs.	1	No	Placement of signs is to be determined by District staff.	2(c)
28	Amendments to Table 17 suggested: • No. 4 should be a walk • No. 12 should be a track • No. 17 should be a track • No. 20 should be deleted (if Mid Mt Barren closed) else 1 day long • No. 21 should be 1 day long • No. 23 should be 1-3 days • No. 24 should read 'Fitzgerald Valley' and 2-3 days.	1	Yes, p. 102	Amend Table 17 accordingly.	1(e)
29	Table 17 should show walk distances.	1	No	This detail will be considered in the implementation.	2(c)
30	Table 17 implies walking will be allowed to the south of the central ranges ie. to Twin Bays.	1	No	This is so but bushwalking will be subject to dieback hygiene measures and access controls when necessary.	2(c)
	15.4 Camping Refer to 14.0 Recreation Sites for comments on camping.				
	15.5 Recreational Fishing *35 submissions. (Refer also to 13.0 Access for comments on recreational fishing access and 14.0 Recreation Sites).*				
1	Access to traditional fishing areas has been denied to locals.	16	No	Access to recreation sites is covered in 13.0 Access and 14.0 Recreation Sites.	2(c)
2	Overnight resting in vehicles or beach camping must be allowed.	10	Yes, p. 103	Overnight resting in vehicles will be permitted on designated 4WD beaches and at some 4WD sites.	1(b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
3	Comments attributed to R Daw (p.115) are incorrect.	3	Yes, p. 103	Remove comments.	1(e)
4	Net fishing should be banned in the Park.	3	No	Regulations pertaining to recreational fishermen are currently being reviewed by the Recreational Fishing Advisory Committee for the Fisheries Department.	2(b)
5	Recommendation 2 that encourages fishermen to join clubs is insulting and not necessary.	2	No	This has been considered.	2(c)
6	Foot access to fishing sites (Rec. 3) would make most beach fishing impossible and shows a lack of knowledge of the area.	2	Yes, p. 104	Reword Recommendation 3.	1(e)
7	Last paragraph, p.115, should be reworded to reflect the significant direct impact of recreational fishing on the environment.	2	No	Covered in text.	2(c)
8	Reword Rec. 3 to "Allow for foot access...".	2	Yes, p. 104	Reword Recommendation 3.	1(e)
9	If net fishing is to continue then increase legal size to 5" mesh for most of season.	1	No	See Comment 4, this section.	2(b)
10	CALM should regularly review policy regarding fishing in inland waterways (net/line - amateur/professional).	1	Yes, p. 104	Add new recommendation.	1(d)
11	Overcrowding due to access restrictions seriously detracts from the social aspect of recreational fishing.	1	No	This has been acknowledged.	2(a)
12	Fishing clubs can contribute their records to research.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
13	Fishing provides opportunity to familiarise young people with environment.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
14	The impact of recreational fishing is a far more important consideration than that of commercial fishing.	1	No	Both forms of fishing have been seriously considered.	2(c)
15	All fishing and vehicle-based camping are best pursued outside the Park.	1	No	Contrary to the Recreation Management Philosophy.	2(b,c,d)
16	Consideration should be given to excluding motor boats from rivers.	1	No	Motor boats have been excluded from the Dempster Inlet and River.	2(c,d)
17	Support the comment that traditional users have had minimal impact.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
18	More attention needs to be given to access for recreational fishing in the Quaalup area.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
19	Beach access should be closed to recreational fishing if breeding birds become evident.	1	No	Covered in 13.0 Access, Recommendation 12.	2(c)
	15.6 Boating *19 submissions.*				
1	Boat launching should be retained at Pt Ann as St Marys is unsuitable.	13	Yes, p. 104	Boat launching will be retained at Pt Ann. Provision for boat trailers will be considered in the site development plan.	1(b)
2	Provision for boat trailers should be considered in access developments.	3	Yes, p. 104	See Comment 1, this section.	1(b,e)
3	Suggest boats with max. length of 15' (5m) and 25h.p. be allowed in Culham Inlet, and 12' (4m) boats with outboard motors in Hamersley Inlet.	2	Yes, p. 104	Amend Recommendation 1 (boat size not specified).	1(e)
4	Boats of 3 m or less are dangerous.	2	Yes, p. 104	See Comment 3, this section.	1(e)
5	It has been suggested that less than 3 m length and max. 9 h.p. may conflict with Marine and Harbours regulations.	1	Yes, p. 104	See Comment 3, this section.	1(e)
6	Car top boats which can be carried by hand are the only suitable boats for use in the Park.	1	No	Covered in Recommendation 1. Generally this is the case, however, small boats on trailers will be allowed at designated sites.	2(c)
7	Boats that require trailers should be treated the same as caravans and limited to launch sites outside the Park.	1	Yes, p. 104	Off-beach parking for boats and trailers will be provided at the Peninsula (Gordon Inlet). Also see Comments 1 and 6, this section.	1(e)
8	Recommend liaison between CALM, Shire and local groups before any alteration to proposed boat launching facility on Hamersley Inlet.	1	No	This is provided for.	2(c)
9	The proposed boat launching facility at Hamersley Inlet is unsuitable in many weather conditions.	1	Yes, p. 104	See Comment 10, this section.	1(b,e)
10	Recommend the old boat launching facility at Hamersley Inlet be retained.	1	Yes, p. 104	The old boat launching facility will be retained at Hamersley Inlet.	1(b,e)
11	Provision should be made somewhere for water-skiing.	1	No	There is no suitable location for this activity.	2(b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	15.7 Horse-riding *9 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	7	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Request that provision be made for the stabling of horses at Quaalup, and access through the Park along the Gairdner River and roadways to the Doubtful Island Peninsula and return.	2	No	Contrary to Park objectives.	2(b,c)
3	Should clearly state that roads are not open to horses.	1	Yes, p. 105	Add information to text.	1(a)
4	Recommendation 2 should include "approval by CALM".	1	Yes, p. 105	Amend Recommendation 2.	1(e)
5	There needs to be a formal arrangement for search and rescue in the Park that covers use of horses for this purpose.	1	No	Plan provides for use of horses in a life-threatening emergency, subject to District approval.	2(c)
	15.8 Groups and Club-based Activities *7 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Proposed club campsite near Kybulup Pool should be relocated.	1	No	Conflict with apiary site has been resolved.	2(c)
3	Club and group camping should be catered for outside the Park.	1	No	Aim is to provide a range of recreation opportunities.	2(c)
4	Commend the concept of group camping.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
5	Maringerup Homestead is a possible site for group camping.	1	Yes, p. 106	Include statement in plan.	1(d)
6	Recommendation 3 should read "...or if enjoyment of other walkers is likely to be affected."	1	Yes, p. 106	Amend Recommendation 3.	1(e)
	15.9 Commercial Operators *5 submissions.*				
1	Support for recommendations.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Should provide for future motel and chalets in centre of Park.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan and contrary to Park objectives.	2(b,d)
3	Need to include reference to new policy and guidelines for concessions.	1	Yes, p. 106	Add information.	1(b,c)
4	Opposed to commercial operations in the Park.	1	No	Commercial operators are subject to strict controls to ensure other users and the environment are not adversely affected.	2(d)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	PART E. MANAGEMENT FOR EDUCATION				
	16.0 INFORMATION, INTERPRETATION AND EDUCATION *25 submissions.*				
1	Support Recommendation 16, re Twertup Field Study Centre.	4	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Support for recommendations.	3	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Support increase in availability of information and interpretation material, or promotion of education.	3	No	No change sought.	2(a)
4	Signs should tell visitors to carry their own wood, take rubbish with them, contained fires only, no dogs etc.	3	No	Signs will be developed according to CALM sign manual. This level of detail will be considered in the implementation phase.	2(c)
5	Agree that general public should be given clear, concise and accurate education as to the need to prevent dieback spread.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
6	Should include the recommendation 'Co-operate with and provide assistance to the FRNPA in the provision of Park information, education and interpretation'.	2	Yes, p. 111	Add new recommendation.	1(d)
7	Park entrances should be clearly posted with signs that can be read from vehicle.	2	No	Information at Park entrances will be supplied in information bays.	2(c)
8	Sign posting at beach campsites should be kept to a miniumum.	1	No	A minimum of signs will be used throughout the Park.	2(c)
9	Signs indicating why changes have been made are fruitless.	1	No	The public needs to be aware of the reasons for management decisions	2(c)
10	CALM should justify its management with appropriate public information.	1	No	This is provided for.	2(c)
11	Campfire activities could be conducted in Hopetoun Caravan Park.	1	No	Covered in Recommendation 12.	2(c)
12	A small campfire circle/amphitheatre could be established at Mylies.	1	No	Site was severely damaged by 1989 wildfires.	2(c)
13	A visitor's centre should be established at East Mt Barren.	1	No	Finances and resources are limited.	2(c)
14	A free visitor newspaper could be produced.	1	No	This will be considered in the implementation phase.	2(c)
15	A more expert, interactive and high profile educational and interpretive service must be provided.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
16	The DMP appears to leave much of the information and interpretation services work to community groups and tourism authorities.	1	No	Aim is to adopt an integrated approach to provision of information, interpretation and education.	2(c)
17	Should consider paying local people to conduct visitors through the Park with or without the ranger.	1	No	Resources are limited. Refer also to 15.9 Commercial Operators.	2(c)
18	Should endeavour to use original place names in any educational program.	1	Yes, p. 110	Original place names will be used provided they are supported by the Shires, CALM's Nomenclature Committee, and the State Geographic Names Committee.	1(b)
19	All walks should have brochures but those for the adventurous could be interpretive only.	1	Yes, p. 102	Covered in 15.3 Bushwalking, Recommendation 7.	1(e)
20	Park maps should include old tracks for bushwalkers.	1	No	Map information will be determined by CALM.	2(b)
21	The sign of the big "i" should be erected 1km either side of the Quiss Rd turn-off indicating the CALM information bay.	1	Yes, p. 110	Amend Recommendation 4.	1(a)
22	Information bay should include services available at Jerramungup, the Jerramungup Information Centre and Museum.	1	No	This will be considered.	2(c)
23	Rangers should be employed to give guided educational walks and tours in the Park along similar lines to those used in Kakadu National Park.	1	No	Supported in principle, however, is constrained by limited finances and resources.	2(c)
24	It may be necessary to employ a part-time education officer for school lectures, production of brochures and displays, and possibly conducting activities for children and adults.	1	No	Covered in Recommendation 12.	2(c)
25	CALM does not educate the whole population with their publications and pamphlets - only the media of T.V. has visual impact on a large scale.	1	No	Finances and resources are limited.	2(b)
26	Add further objective : Increase staff levels and appropriate facilities.	1	No	Refer to 19.0 Staff.	2(c)
27	Pamphlet discussed in Recommendation 8 should be a low cost production.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(a)
28	Alter Recommendation 1 from "liaison with community groups .." to "assistance to ...".	1	No	Not considered necessary.	2(c)
29	Opposed to provision of 'coast risk signs' (Recommendation 6). Warnings placed on brochures and information boards should suffice.	1	No	CALM is advised by Crown Law to notify public of safety issues.	2(b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
30	Recommendation 7c is not appropriate as all visitors should have equal opportunity of exploring the Park.	1	No	Recommendation is not biased towards any particular group.	2(c)
31	Marking of Telegraph and Moir Tracks on Hamersley Drive is necessary for easy use of the heritage trail.	1	No	This is provided for.	2(c)
32	Recommendation 7a should read : consider placement of MRD approved sign	1	No	Not considered necessary.	2(b)
33	Recommendation 9 is a further duplication of effort.	1	Yes, p. 111	Incorporate Recommendation 9 into Recommendation 8.	1(e)
34	Walk trails in Recommendation 11 should be cross-referenced with Table 17, p.114, or if these are new trails, then add a rider to Table 17.	1	Yes, p. 111	Amend Recommendation 11.	1(e)
35	Recommendation 12 should read : Hopetoun Caravan Park could/may ...	1	Yes, p. 111	Amend Recommendation 12.	1(e)
36	Recommendation 13 : Pull-overs on Hamersley Drive will require careful site planning.	1	No	This will be considered in the implementation phase.	2(a)
	PART F. RESEARCH AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS				
	17.0 RESEARCH AND MONITORING *15 submissions.*				
1	Support establishment of CALM research facility.	6	No	No change sought.	2(a)
2	Support for recommendations.	5	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Research station should be established at Jacup.	2	No	This will be considered.	2(a)
4	Accommodation should be provided for short term live-in researchers in the long term.	2	No	Accommodation is available at Twertup Study Centre.	2(c)
5	Research station should be combined with a field studies centre.	1	No	Various options will be considered.	2(a)
6	Twertup has severe limitations for future use as a field studies centre.	1	No	This is acknowledged.	2(a,c)
7	Consideration should be given to the proposed research facility being developed and shared with the FBP which is need of a base.	1	No	This will be given consideration.	2(c)
8	Proposed research facility would be better located in one of the established towns, rather than at Jacup.	1	No	Considered in Recommendation 2.	2(a,c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
9	Ravensthorpe is not the place for a research facility as it is too far from the resource.	1	No	Potential locations for research station are to be assessed.	2(a)
10	Research and management personel should be based in Ravensthorpe.	1	No	Addressed in South Coast Region Management Plan (CALM, in prep)	2(c)
11	Some at least, of the rivers should be gauged to give basic data on flow and water quality.	1	No	Covered in Research and Monitoring (Table 18).	2(c)
12	All recreation sites should be monitored for degradation.	1	No	Covered in Research and Monitoring (Table 18).	2(c)
13	All tracks and roads should be monitored at least weekly.	1	No	Covered in Research and Monitoring (Table 18). Frequency of monitoring is dependent on available resources.	2(c)
14	Rare flora/fauna sites should be frequently monitored.	1	No	Covered in Research and Monitoring (Table 18). Frequency of monitoring is dependent on available resources.	2(c)
15	Regrowth in fire areas should be monitored annually.	1	No	Covered in Research and Monitoring (Table 18). Frequency of monitoring is dependent on available resources.	2(c)
16	Feral cat and fox sightings should be monitored.	1	No	Covered in Research and Monitoring (Table 18).	2(c)
17	All research and monitoring recommendations relating to rare flora should include the priority species of Table 8, p.40.	1	No	Covered in Research and Monitoring (Table 18).	2(c)
18	Further research on birdlife should be conducted by W.A. Museum or RAOU.	1	No	Refer to 7.3 Fauna.	2(c)
19	Research on rare fauna in northern area must have highest priority.	1	No	Covered in Research and Monitoring (Table 18).	2(c)
20	Question whether FRNPA were formally involved in Chapman-Newbey survey, p.130.	1	No	The FRNPA were formally involved in biological survey.	2(c)
21	Funding for research is not adequately addressed.	1	No	Refer to 21.0 Funding.	2(c)
	PART G. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN				
	18.0 MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES				
	5 submissions.				
1	Support for six highest priorities listed.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
2	Given that dieback is the major threat to the Park, suggest that the current No. 2 priority be exchanged with No.1.	1	Yes, p. 123	Exchange No. 2 priority with No. 1.	1(e)
3	Suggest for Point 4 that CALM assess the possibility of retaining small camping areas at Pt Ann, Mylies and Quoin Head for the time being.	1	No	Refer to 14.0 Recreation Sites.	2(c)
4	Suggest for Point 4 that camping be retained at Quoin Head on a permit basis in the short term.	1	No	Refer to 14.0 Recreation Sites.	2(c)
5	Recreation needs of people are rated second and third last in list of priorities which makes the recreation section sound rather hollow.	1	No	Refer to 11.0 Recreation Management Philosophy.	2(c)
	19.0 STAFF *13 submissions.*				
1	An increase in number of staff is needed to implement plan successfully.	9	Yes, p. 124	Add new recommendation.	1(d)
2	Support for recommendations.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	Ranger's residence at East Mt Barren should be left where it is but a solution be found to the flooding of Culham Inlet.	2	No	Problem has been addressed.	2(c)
4	CALM should have a permanent officer based in Ravensthorpe.	2	No	Addressed in South Coast Region Management Plan (CALM, in prep)	2(c)
5	Support re-location of ranger's residence to east side of Culham Inlet.	1	No	No change sought.	2(a)
6	It may be possible to install a ranger at the south western corner however a more suitable site would be in or near Quaalup enclave.	1	Yes, p. 124	Amend Recommendation 2. Possible sites will be investigated in or adjacent to the south-western part of the Park.	1(e)
7	Should have a ranger residing at the West River Road entrance point.	1	No	Finances and resources are limited.	2(c)
8	A ranger station should be located at the Hopetoun end.	1	No	This is already provided for.	2(c)
9	It would be advantageous to have maintenance staff to carry out daily maintenance and new constructions.	1	No	Finances and resources are limited.	2(a)
10	There will be no improvement in the local CALM image until there are sufficient staff to attend most local meetings.	1	No	This has been acknowledged.	2(a)
11	Staff requirement details should be spelt out as an indicator of budgetary needs.	1	No	Too specific for a 10 year management plan which is subject to the vagaries of funding.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
	20.0 LIAISON **20.1 Community Liaison** *31 submissions.* Due to a printing error, page 137 was omitted from many copies of the draft management plan. This page contained recommendations relating to Community Liaison and Government Agency Liaison.				
1	Advocate the establishment of a local management committee to improve communication between Park officials and local residents.	18	No	Covered in Recommendation 1.	2(c)
2	Support for ongoing liaison between CALM and local residents.	8	No	No change sought.	2(a)
3	The management committee should be directly responsible to NPNCA and a sub-group of the committee should be used to improve relations between CALM and local residents.	2	No	Covered in Recommendation 1. The Committee would be responsible to the South Coast Regional Manager. CALM Link has been established to improve realations.	2(c)
4	Delegates on management committee should represent CALM, Shires, FRNPA, Biosphere Project, Bush Fires Board, sporting groups and farmers.	2	No	Any revision to the structure and membership will be made in consultation with the existing Advisory Committee.	2(c)
5	Management committee should include representatives from Ravensthorpe Area Promotions, Hopetoun Tourist Association, Offshore Angling Club and local soil conservation groups.	1	No	See Comment 4, this section.	2(c)
6	Management policy committee should have solid representation from outside the local district, and certain non-local specialist members of the committee should be given power of veto over a certain level of policy decisions.	1	No	See Comment 4, this section.	2(c)
7	Local people should be given the power, adequate information, funding assistance and accountability.	1	No	Local input to Park management issues will be co-ordinated by the proposed Management Advisory Committee.	2(c)
8	Local should have a high level of involvement, responsibility and power to influence management decisions.	1	No	See Comment 7, this section.	2(c)
9	It would be to both CALM's and the community's advantage to enter into planning discussions on emergency situations which could occur in the Park, by liaison with Ravensthorpe S.E.S. and the Ravensthorpe Local Counter Disaster Advisory Committee.	1	Yes, p. 125	CALM will liaise with both Shires on a contingency plan.	1(d)
10	Recommend a Regional Management Advisory Committee and CALM provide sufficient funding to employ at least one full-time liaison officer.	1	No	See Comment 1, this section.	2(c)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
11	Participation by the Quaalup community in Park management should be actively sought.	1	No	See Comment 7, this section.	2(c)
12	CALM should liaise with and assist Quaalup Homestead owners in promoting use of their facilities.	1	No	Liaison is ongoing.	2(b,c)
13	The Park should be governed by rural bodies.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b,c)
14	The public should be encouraged to comment in writing on their experiences with Park rangers whether positive or negative.	1	No	See Comment 7, this section.	2(c)
	20.2 Government Agency Liaison Due to a printing error, page 137 was omitted from many copies of the draft management plan. This page contained recommendations relating to Community Liaison and Government Agency Liaison. There were no submissions on this section.				
	21.0 FUNDING *16 submissions.*				
1	The plan must stress the need for increased funding.	3	No	This has been stressed.	2(a,c)
2	No indication of costs of the proposed program is provided.	3	No	Annual budgets are prepared on Regional level and are subject to the vagaries of funding and changing priorities.	2(c)
3	Support for recommendations.	2	No	No change sought.	2(a)
4	It may be necessary to ensure that essential works are carried out as non-essential works may become sub-ordinate undertakings dependent on funding.	2	Yes, p. 127	Works will be carried out on a priority basis.	1(e)
5	The plan must be accompanied by a committment from the State government to fund its implementation.	2	Yes, p. 127	See Comment 2, this section. CALM establishes priorities within its own budget but cannot set State Government priorities.	1(d)
6	Plan could be improved if it contained a timetable and budget for implement-ation.	2	No	See Comment 2, this section.	2(c)
7	Fees could be charged for overnight camping.	2	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
8	Entrance fees could be charged.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO. OF SUBS	PLAN AMENDED	DISCUSSION / ACTION TAKEN	CRITERIA
9	Fines could be imposed for littering.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
10	Government needs to show its good faith by active involvement in and resourcing of the FBR.	1	No	Refer to 4.0 International Biosphere Reserve Status.	2(c)
11	Funds for Park management could be obtained from donations collected at gated entrances, or from money saved by stopping roadworks and firebreak construction.	1	No	The use of honour-boxes has recently been approved. Their use in the Park will be investigated.	2(c)
12	Funding could be asked for from those companies benefitting financially from other areas of CALM, e.g. timber companies.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b)
13	The plan should include strategies for the attraction of funds from other sources in the likely event that sufficient funds will not be forthcoming from the government.	1	No	Covered in Recommendations 3 and 4.	2(c)
14	CALM should liaise with relevant public groups to stimulate approaches to other agencies for funding of research and management.	1	No	Covered in Recommendation 4.	2(c)
15	Any extra expenditure required of local government should be identified and met, at least in part, by a specific allocation of funds from the State Govt.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b,c)
16	State and Federal Governments must allocate the resources to meet the management committments of the local community.	1	No	Beyond scope of plan.	2(b,c)
	22.0 EVALUATION AND REVIEW *2 submissions.*				
1	The Fitzgerald River National Park Advisory Committee, under the guidance of the NPNCA, should be investigating ways that the Biosphere Reserve concept can be implemented within Shire Councils and CALM area management plans.	1	No	Ongoing liaison will occur but CALM can not, and should not, impose pressure on Local Authorities outside its areas of direct responsibility.	2(b)
2	The plan does not allow any mechanism to make alterations during its 10 year tenure. Should at any stage, an item within the plan become undesirable, this needs to be rectified.	1	Yes, p. 128	Amend text for clarity.	1(e)

APPENDIX 1. SUBMITTORS TO THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Individuals

Andrews, B
Archer, W L
Baldwin, W J
Barrett, G H
Bartlett, L J
Bee, G
Belli Family
Benson, K C
Bevan, G
Bevan, N T
Birss, W
Bond, J
Bond, K G
Bourgault du Coudray, P
Bowling, B
Bowling, S R
Bradby, K
Brett, J
Carmichael, A C
Carruthers, B
Chambers, A S & S
Chambers, G W
Clarke, B
Clarke, W A
Cooper, Dr R
Crane, R B & D M
D'Emden, P G & H M
Daw, M F & A M
Delmenico, K J
Dougherty, P
Duncan, A
Dunne, S L
Ebbett, R G
Edmondson, V
Edwards, P
Elverd, D
Fregon, B A & J J
Goldfinch, I
Goldfinch, R
Gordon, D L & S S
Hancock, C
Hannig, K
Heenan, K
Hill, J P
Hobley, R
Hodgkin, E P
Hollamby, E G
Holme, K D
Jackman, H A
Jackson, A
James, D F
Jasper, R
Jewell, D
Kennedy, K R
King, W J
Kuiper, Mr and Mrs D
Landwehr, G
Lawrence, J S
Lee, P
Lilford, H C
Lowe, S
Lullfitz, D
Marden, R P
McClurg, B
McCulloch, J
McDonald, D J & H M
McIntosh, O
McMillan, R P
Meade, E
Meade, M
Metz, P
Mueller, O
Napier, G R
Nelson, V
Newbey, B
North, B
O'Brien, G
Orr, J
Owen, D
Palfrey, D J
Palmer, M
Pearce, H
Pinniger, L
Pumphrey, M
Ranzetta, G
Richards, R
Richardson, K, Wooller R
Roberts, M & M R
Rowe, C
Rowe, K
Sandiford, L
Schultz, R
Scott, D A
Sharp, A N
Sharp, A N Snr
Sharp, B A
Sharp, G M
Sharp, T W
Siviour, I K & J A
Taylor, H
Thomas, M L
Thomas, D R
Thomas, G
Tyscoe, D H
Warren, R N
Waters, K
Webster, I S
Wheatcroft, D K
Will, R
Wilson, A & J
Wilson, M A P
Wlech, M M
Woollett, J, Fryer, J, & Spitty, J
Wordsworth, Hon. D J
Year 8 students, Ravensthorpe District High
Year 9 students, Ravensthorpe District High

APPENDIX 1 (cont)

Clubs, Organisations and Associations

Association of Mining & Exploration Companies Inc.
Australian Conservation Foundation (W.A.)
Australian Anglers Association
Bremer Bay Horseman's Club
Conservation Council of W.A. Inc.
Country Women's Association, Gairdner Branch
Fitzgerald Biosphere Project
Fitzgerald River National Park Association
Gairdner Progress Association
Great Southern Recreational Fishing Association
Jerdacuttup Community Association
Land Management Society
Offshore Angling Club of W.A.
Perth Bushwalkers
Royal Australasian Ornithologists Union
South Coast Licensed Fishermen's Association
South Coast Recreation Association
South West Forests Defence Foundation Inc.
The Men of the Trees (Inc.)
The Wilderness Society (W.A.)
W.A. Association of 4WD Clubs
W.A. National Parks and Reserves Association
W.A. Naturalists Club
W.A. Recreational and Sportfishing Council Inc.
Wetlands Conservation Society

Government Agencies

Agriculture Protection Board
Bush Fires Board
Dept of Aboriginal Sites
Dept of Agriculture
Dept of Conservation and Land Management
Dept of Regional Development & the North West
Dept of Resources Development
Fisheries Department
Main Roads Department
Shire of Jerramungup
Shire of Lake Grace
Shire of Ravensthorpe
State Planning Commission of W.A.
Water Authority of W.A.
Western Australian Museum