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Purpose of this Report

This document provides an agreed reflection of the Minutes of the Two Rocks Marina Reference Group No. 4 on July 18, 2018 in Two Rocks.

Agenda

The Two Rocks Marina Reference Group meeting considered the following agenda items:

- Welcome / Introductions
- Site Walk and Q&A
- Confirmation of minutes and feedback
- Existing Operations Overview
- $6 Million Planned Upgrade - Expenditure Re-cap & Works Status
- No Reclamation Concept - Presentation and Q&A
- Asbestos Management
- General business
- Next meeting, evaluation and close

Presentation

The Two Rocks Marina Reference Group Meeting No. 4 Minutes are attached to this document at Appendix A.
Two Rocks Marina Reference Group Meeting 4

Date: July 18 2018
Time: 5:00pm
Location: On site - Two Rocks Marina and Sun City Yacht Club – Two Rocks Marina

Members:
Chair: Mayor Tracey Roberts (City of Wanneroo) - TR
Councillor Natalie Sangalli (City of Wanneroo) - NS
Donna West (Department of Transport) - DW
Ellena Bromwell (Department of Transport) - EB
Mat Selby (Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage) - MS
Ian Martinus (City of Wanneroo administration) - IM
Mick Bowra (Business Representative) - MBL
Commodore Wayne Hartas (Sun City Yacht Club) - WH
Brad Lynton (Community Representative) - BL
Mark Weir (Business Representative) - MW
Elysia Regan (Two Rocks Beach Action Group) – ER
John Young (Business Representative) - JY
Nick Perrignon (Business Representative) - NP
Jenny Butler (Community Representative) - JB
Michael Bower (Business Representative) – MBF
Bill White (Two Rocks Volunteer Marine Sea Rescue)
Greg Norris (Proxy for Peter Russel – Pen Holder) - GN
Observers/ Presenters

- Stephen Smith (Department of Transport) - SS
- Anna Kelderman (Department of Transport) – AK
- Anand Patel (Department of Transport) – AP
- Justin Todd (Department of Transport) - JT
- Pas Bracone (City of Wanneroo) – PB
- Geoff Cameron – GC
- John Newton – JN

Apologies

NA

Minutes

Previous Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action No</th>
<th>Meeting No</th>
<th>Actions Open</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plaque on wall in building A or B referencing Australia’s Cup history - DoT to search and see if plaque can be found. Plaque to be kept as written history of area – potentially used as feature in future development</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DoT to provide greater detail on the purpose and need for the reclamation area at Reference Group Meeting 2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DoT to undertake additional design review for proposed reclamation areas</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DoT to provide a presentation of planning process to date, including studies and investigations, and to provide presentation of current concepts.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DoT to publish Minutes</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DoT to continue summarising feedback and monitoring Facebook</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All members to respect information that is marked not-for-publication</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DoT to provide a detailed presentation on the funding/expenditure allocation and provide details on what is required within the marina in the short term</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BL to liaise with AK where clarification is required (social media).</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Members to contact AK with any concerns (Social Media, other communications)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DoT to assess options for maritime industry requirements that could be achieved with no reclamation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Members to advise DoT or MBL if any defects are noted in recent works.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DoT to continue to provide updates on timing and commitments</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DoT to amend Opportunities and Constraints Plan and save to webpage</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DoT to consider alternative southern breakwater alignment options and present further research/reports</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DoT to provide ongoing feedback on bubble curtain trials at Jurien Bay</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DoT to consider improved pedestrian access to the south</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DoT to send an email to the Reference Group Members if any works are imminent</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AK to provide MBL with sign in sheet for records</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All feedback provided to DoT will be compiled and shared with other group members.</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SS to progress services investigation works</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AK to seek preferred dates and times from Reference Group Members.</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AK to coordinate template for position papers and distribute</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DoT to coordinate procurement and involve members as agreed</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AK to circulate email list with Minutes</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions Completed**

<p>| 3.3  | 3  | AK to amend previous Minutes to clearly state strong opposition of reclamation from community representatives | Complete |
| 3.4  | 3  | DoT to amend $6 million Planned Upgrade 2017-2019 plan on webpage by removing reclamation areas | Complete |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective ID</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DoT to investigate safety signage for breakwater area (breakwater safety and seagrass wrack)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Confirm City of Busselton management process (seagrass removal)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Members to respond to evaluation</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AK to send BL photo of rock plaque and BL to upload image to Facebook page. Members to seek any other feedback</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AK to forward any updates about the next meeting at least 1 week prior</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reference Group Members to provide feedback by 11 May (for items for Reference Group Meeting no. 3)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All members to provide any further feedback on the opportunities and constraints plan before 11 May 2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DoT to provide comparison metrics of boat harbours</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DoT to provide population numbers and plans per City of Wanneroo presentation</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DoT to provide structure plan links to the Reference Group members</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DoT and BL to circulate posts to Reference Group members before posting</td>
<td>Rescinded (RG3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DoT to invite FJM Property to Reference Group</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Request Reference Group Members to nominate a penholder representative and DoT to invite new member</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DoT to prepare information regarding studies and investigations as they relate to design issues/challenges to RG2</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DoT to liaise with CoW regarding inputs to RG2</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Meeting Minutes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Walk</strong></td>
<td>AK to provide MBL with sign-in sheet for records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Meeting No. 4 commenced at 5pm (for a 5:15pm start) to allow enough light for a site walk around the marine industry area to observe ongoing works and identify areas where maintenance and upgrade is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All participants signed in to the site walk. Sign-in sheet to be provided to MBL for records or site access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A preliminary introduction was made to JT and AP who will provide comment during the site walk. MBL led the site walk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants were provided with an overview of key assets within the industry area and associated with the marina pens and were able to observe repaired areas, areas subject to ongoing repairs and areas that will still require upgrade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular note was made of the boat lifter jetties, the main wharf, the vessel fuel cabinet, west-link and east-link jetties, the north wharf, diesel storage tank area and new fuel line, all pen jetties, Building A and Building B, the Two Rocks Volunteer Marine Rescue Group jetty and the general marina hardstand area. Abandoned vessels were also discussed, as well as environmental management activities that had been undertaken associated with removal/decommissioning of old fuel line and drainage. Existing Key Assets are identified in Appendix A to these minutes for reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welcome/Introductions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members returned to the Sun City Yacht Club for the formal meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chair welcomed members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confirmation of minutes and feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes were endorsed - Moved BL, Seconded JB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confirmation of minutes and feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK provided a brief update on feedback provided and information to be included as regular items on Reference Group meeting agendas. The following items will be included:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Process to date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funding breakdown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Repairs/works complete, ongoing or required, and timeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Updates regarding wrack and erosion issues
- Ongoing works/activities on site

**Detailed information/items for resolution:**

AK provided a brief presentation on items that have been resolved per the minutes

- Updates to the website:
  - $6 million upgrade plan updated and replaced
  - Opportunities and Constraints plan updated and replaced
  - Updated minutes from Reference Group Meeting No. 2
  - Presentation from Reference Group Meeting No. 3

- Signs have been erected warning of the risk of walking along the breakwater in response to safety concerns

- Members sought clarification on weed management at Busselton as it was indicated that Busselton removed and disposed of weed. Further information obtained clarifies that weed is moved and then returned to the same coastal environment rather than being disposed offsite.

**Further information/discussion/feedback**

AK provided a brief overview on items to be discussed in the following presentations or through ongoing design work:

- Reclamation of land. In response to action items 1.4, 1.5 and 3.5 from previous minutes, a concept which could illustrate a possible 'no-reclamation' option has been prepared and is to be presented.

- Provision of public space. The project team are aware of the ongoing expectation of the marina environment to provide public space. This will continue to factor into design work.

- Aquaculture. The project team continues to work with the City of Wanneroo to identify the need and opportunity for aquaculture at Two Rocks. This will continue to factor into design work.

- Provision of information prior to the meeting. The project team confirmed that they would attempt to improve provision of meeting information in advance, where time permits and where the information is suitably advanced and self-explanatory. Some information would need to be provided at the meeting to improve the understanding of the information presented. The project team also committed to providing better information to take away post the meeting so that Members could take the time to provide suitable responses.

- Development of the masterplan. AK acknowledged the feedback that had been provided by members of the group and the effort that had gone into considering plans for the marina. The project team advised that there is suitable information now available, as well as demand and energy from the Members, to undertake a master planning workshop. The objective, time, date and membership of the workshop is to be agreed as the final discussion of the meeting.

Members sought clarification on a number of items:
The Chair suggested that feedback provided directly to DoT be provided to all Members of the group so that everyone is working with the same information. AK agreed that this would occur.

The Chair indicated that a potential master planning sub-group would require some discussion. It was acknowledged this would be discussed later in the meeting.

### Existing Operation Review

The Chair sought any further questions in relation to the existing operations at the marina (in light of the site walk).

Members sought clarification on a number of items:

- Members asked how business was going in the marina. MBL indicated that:
  - Business is good. Since many of the historical issues in terms of quality of the facility and the standard of service had now been resolved with the new harbour manager and operators, business has been returning to the marina. The removal of abandoned vessels has been important to the look of the area.
  - Anticipation is now growing for the next steps. Users recognise that it is now a much safer place to operate.
  - Users would like to see the vision now for the future.
  - Boaties are now coming back.
- Members noted that if business is good then the future looks good.

### $6 Million Planned Upgrade - Expenditure Re-cap & Works Status

As part of the ongoing information items DW provided an overview of the existing committed works packages and updated forecast expenditure.

DW clarified (per the previous minutes) that some minor changes to the spreadsheet had occurred due to some repair works that had been expended but omitted from the previous summary (relating to urgent maintenance and repair works). However, DW also noted that as projects have been further advanced the overall forecast figure has not increased substantially. DW committed to providing ongoing updates.

JT provided a summary of works that had occurred or were in the process of being complete.

SS indicated that a services investigation was an urgent need – and would be required regardless what plan was proposed. An estimate of $50,000 was given for that investigation. NP suggested that the services investigation should be progressed.

**The Chair sought confirmation that expenditure for a services investigation is supported.**

NP Moved, WH Seconded.
Members also queried to need for DFES consultant to ensure fire safety. SS indicated that DoT would continue to liaise with DFES as required.

Members queried the total cost for demolition of both buildings. Demolition costs advised were $350,000 for Building B and $400,000 for Building A. Members discussed that the demolition of the buildings was generally a positive outcome. Members were advised that demolition of buildings would result in the need to accommodate existing tenants, which would also be a cost.

**No Reclamation Concept**

SS provided a summary overview of concept designs that had been presented to date noting that all concept are ideas on the way forward and further noting that these ideas can be used in the master planning workshop to help guide the participants.

The concepts included the original Public Information Briefing concept and the concepts presented at Reference Group Meeting No. 2. SS presented a further concept that had been developed upon request from MBL after Reference Group Meeting No. 2. This concept investigated if the boat lifter jetties could remain in their current position for the longer term. The negatives and positives for were discussed with the key issue being the separation of the boat lifter yard into 2 separate lots. A cost and area comparison of the two reclamation options (reclamation only) included in previous concepts was provided.

Following this recap SS presented the key feedback that had been received by the members. It was noted that Building B was the only building proposed to be demolished but that members had also suggested demolition of Building A. DoT indicated support for the demolition of Building A too in the near-term due to the asbestos in the building and the high cost of ongoing maintenance and monitoring if it were to be kept over the long-term.

In response to the feedback received, and with particular focus on the possibility of a ‘no reclamation’ option, an option was presented. SS provided a brief overview and Members sought clarification on a number of items:

- Members sought clarification on the number of trailer bays suggested. SS confirmed that the bays shown respond to the Australian Standard 3962 and in general that the DoT provides 40 bays per ramp.

- Members sought clarification on the need for more boat launching at the marina. SS indicated that DoT regularly monitors and responds to the demand for boating facilities, notable through the Perth Recreational Boating Facilities Study (PRBFS) prepared in 2008 and currently under review. The PRBFS considers existing facilities, usage in the Perth metro area and forecast growth - boat registrations by LG & population. The 2008 study recommended 2 additional lanes
& 80 car trailer bays. Timing is uncertain, but will relate to the ongoing growth of population in the corridor.

- Members sought clarification on whether reclamation options would be able to use dredge spoil or re-use rock to reduce costs. JT indicated that although the preference is that this rock armour will be able to be re-used, the decision about the suitability of this existing rock armour for re-use will be made at the detailed design phase (if/when this detailed design is undertaken). However, it is not considered likely that the dredge material will be suitable and clean fill would need to be sourced.

- Members sought clarification on where the Volunteer Marine Sea Rescue (VMSR) building is in the concept shown. SS identified the location and indicated that the allowance is shown as the same size building as currently used.

- Members suggested that FESA would need fire fighting tanks. SS indicated that existing pressures and flows in the water main external to the harbour were sufficient without tanks and pumps however upgrading the system into the harbour would require investigation. DoT would adopt a similar strategy to that at Casuarina Boat Harbour (Bunbury) where pressure and flows were acceptable, but that land planning allocated appropriate space should pressures and flows in the main reduce in the future (future proofing).

- Members sought clarification on what would happen with the existing boat ramp car parks in the south if the car park is relocated. SS indicated that no detailed design had been undertaken for that option but that it was possible the area could be redesigned to improve the layout of car bays for ordinary vehicles and that some of the area could be used for public/community purposes.

- Members sought clarification on where the aquaculture was shown in the plan. SS indicated that in the no-reclamation option shown there was no allowance for additional buildings as there was insufficient land area. SS indicated that this could be included if reclamation was supported north of the existing maritime area.

- Members sought clarification on why the DoT had prepared the new plan and who had prepared it, given that the consensus was that a master plan is required. SS indicated that the new plan was prepared to respond directly to feedback from the group that a no-reclamation option was expected to be prepared. DoT prepared the plan after considering all the requirements (both maritime industry and community). There was some disagreement amongst members as to whether a reclamation option was required/necessary.

  - It was agreed that undertaking the no-reclamation option was expected and that showing the plan enabled the members to see another alternative.
- The interest in the design is a signal that the master plan needs to be done sooner rather than later as discussed.

- A master planner needs to be properly briefed on the key expectations of the DoT and the community and it was noted that the community expectations had been clearly and correctly identified.

- Members sought clarification on the detail of the plan shown. SS indicated that the detail was needed to prove that the option could work, given the spatial constraints which are more significant in this option. TR noted that the challenge of a constrained site is noted as is the work completed to date to develop workable concepts.

- TR sought clarification from MBL that the concept design for the boat lifter yard was adequate for needs. MBL indicated that the area shown was inadequate and that 30-35 bays are required for break even and to enable the business to operate with normal market fluctuation. MBL indicated that the size of area shown would detrimentally impact the business (could make it unviable). TR indicated that the loss of business in the area would be unacceptable.

- Members sought clarification on the activation of the space. SS indicated that the area shown on the south of the maritime industry area could be used for temporary activation and showed an example of Augusta, where a development site has been grassed and is currently being used for temporary events.

- TR sought clarification on the need for the area previously indicated for aquaculture. IM provided a brief overview of CoW’s activities regarding attracting aquaculture:
  - CoW have been investigating options for relocating the Australian Centre for Applied Aquaculture Research from a constrained site in Fremantle. The Centre currently runs courses and undertakes maritime studies.
  - A 2007 report shows growth of the industry and options of aquaculture in Two Rocks have been identified (by CoW) and could result in new buildings, ocean pens, fingerlings hatchery etc resulting in local jobs and new industry.
  - CoW has approached the Federal Department of Jobs, Tourism, Science and Innovation and the State Government is also is aware of plan by CoW.
  - CoW administration is currently preparing a report to Elected Members to embed aquaculture as a key economic driver.
  - The space for aquaculture is definitely needed and the amount of land available is critical. The Fremantle site is constrained and has building area of approximately 2,000m². The Geraldton example is approximately
3,000m² and is probably adequate, with land area additional to building footprint. Building is approximately a $2 million expenditure and needs to be purpose built.

- Currently Curtin does multiple species and looks at education too which could be very well suited in the North Metropolitan area.

- TR reiterated how important is that employment and industry is considered in the precinct and how well it could work with the education sector.

- JB indicated that a new opportunity like aquaculture would be of great interest and could potentially encourage greater uptake of primary industry in young people in the area.

- Members queried if aquaculture is shown in Ocean Reef plans. Current advice suggests that this is not the case so there is not likely to be a conflict.

- Members sought clarification on how new concepts for expansion to the north would fit in with the concept plans. Concern that integration might be challenging if car parks impact access to the north or other development. SS indicated that staging would need to be considered and also the likely timeframes for expansion versus asset life length (i.e. how long an asset will last before it requires replacement).

- Members sought further clarification of what will happen in the southern area if the ramps are relocated. It was suggested that this could form part of the master planning and that the master planning should focus on the bigger picture and beyond the $6 million budget; the plan could be something delivered in stages over time when funds are available.

The Chair suggested that the latest concept continued to address the issues including the core business needs of the marina and the safety requirements of the marina. Master planning work will enable other issues to be resolved.

**Asbestos Presentation**

AP provided a presentation regarding the asbestos within the facility. AP indicated that since taking over the marina DoT had completed several reports and asset audits, with a particular focus on asbestos as it was apparent that asbestos was present and could have been an issue.

It was noted that due to the age of the facilities DoT operate the presence of some asbestos is not uncommon, but the key was to ensure that is it actively and properly managed. AP noted that within the 30 facilities that DoT manages, asbestos containing materials have been gradually removed in a systematic over a period of time. Asbestos is present and being actively managed at 13 facilities (one of which includes Two Rocks).

Early reports indicated that the facility was not causing a public safety risk, but that regular monitoring was required. A second
report suggested a higher level of monitoring was required and recommended 6 monthly inspections; which are occurring.

There is an Asbestos Management Plan in place for the facility, including an asbestos register and maintenance log, and inspections follow the standard requirements using qualified / specialists. Some asbestos has been removed, as it had deteriorated to the point where it was found to require removal in accordance with the legislative requirements. However ongoing monitoring continues to show that the risk is being managed with no airborne particles detected.

An asset management plan for the buildings was also developed which considers the asbestos investigations and is being followed. It was noted that the cost to maintain the buildings is quite expensive and that removal of both would have a positive impact on operational costs of the marina. It was noted that the ongoing cost to maintain Building B was greater than Building A, which is why the demolition of Building B was a priority over the demolition of Building A.

- Members sought clarification on the timeframes that removal should occur by. AP and JT clarified that the asset management plan was prepared in 2017 which looked at ongoing building maintenance costs. The outcome from this work was that from an ongoing maintenance cost perspective both buildings should be demolished (or replaced /repurposed). It was recommended that Building B be demolished within 2 years and Building A be demolished within 5 years.

**General business**

**Master planning**

Members were requested to consider the development of a sub-group to undertake the master planning exercise and to provide suggestions regarding the time and date of same. Estimated time requirement is a full day and as such a weekend or weekday option were discussed.

TR indicated that it would be a preference that the meeting is open to all members of the Reference Group. Members voted on preferences for weekend or weekday event. The majority of members are able to make weekdays, whilst a smaller number can attend a weekend workshop. The workshop will be held on a weekday (date to be determined).

TR suggested that all members should develop their expected outcomes for the masterplan such that the workshop starts from a position of shared knowledge. AK indicated that a template form would be provided for all participants to provide a position paper to the group.

NP recommended an independent master planner (town planner) and facilitator to deliver the workshop and develop the resulting masterplan. It was also suggested that a technical engineering
(coastal) consultant be included – referencing MP Rodgers who is already involved.

A preliminary discussion suggested coordinating the master planner and delivering the workshop within 4 weeks to retain the regular meeting cycle however it was recognised that procurement and coordination may take longer. A suggested timeframe was 8 weeks. Members requested that DoT try and procure and coordinate as soon as possible. Members expressed interest in being involved in the procurement process and TR, NP, MS and JB nominated to provide support to DoT to select the relevant consultant.

General

AK indicated that the standard feedback form would be provided to members for evaluation. In addition, DoT will continue to engage with lessees, users and other stakeholders.

Members requested that group email addresses be shared with all participants. AK confirmed that no members had an issue with this from a confidentiality perspective. An email list will be circulated.

NP suggested that all members should start to consider how to leverage additional funding to deliver more outcomes. A number of members expressed their ability to focus on advocacy for further funding. A suggestion was made to consider formal presentation to Minister MacTiernan, AG Quigly at the State level or Christian Porter at the Federal level. These representatives may be invited to a presentation from the group at a later date.

NP suggested further looking into what type of tourism activities would be desirable at Two Rocks and consider how it could be attracted. It was suggested that there may be opportunities to work with Tourism WA and understand what tenderers missed out at Rottnest and if they could be approached to bring their ideas to Two Rocks.

Next Meeting

To be determined. The next Reference Group Meeting will occur after the master planning workshop.

| DoT to coordinate procurement and involve members as agreed |
| AK to circulate email list with Minutes |

Close
Appendix A – Existing Key Assets
Existing Key Assets

1. Boat Lift Jetties
2. Main Wharf
3. Vessel Fuel Cabinet
4. West-Link Jetty
5. North Wharf
6. East-Link Jetty
7. Diesel Storage Tank
8. Marina Hardstand Area
9. Building A
10. Building B
11. Two Rocks Volunteer Marine Rescue Group Floating Jetty
12. P Jetty