

PORT KENNEDY RESORT DEVELOPMENT, COSTS

115. Hon Jim Scott to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

Further to question No. 220 of November 6 2001 in relation to the Port Kennedy Resort Development costs -

- (1) Will the Minister provide full details and receipts for costs listed for Community Involvement - \$64.90, \$1094.99 and \$381.24?
- (2) Will the Minister table either the documentation or the invoice to the developers for the fire truck?
- (3) Why is this vehicle being leased instead of purchased as originally proposed?
- (4) Was the vehicle for Fire and Rescue purchased or leased?
- (5) What happens to the interest earned from the trust account from which the lease fees are paid?
- (6) How many times has the CALM vehicle at Port Kennedy been used for fire fighting?
- (7) How many times and for how many kilometres has the golf course manager used the vehicle?
- (8) How many kilometres has the vehicle travelled?
- (9) Has the vehicle been used elsewhere by CALM?
- (10) Have the shelters mentioned been installed?
- (11) Will the Minister detail the vandalism reported in the Port Kennedy Scientific Park for the last two years?
- (12) In answer to question (8), it was claimed the LCDC fencing is shown in the brochure. This is not the case. Will the Minister provide specific mapping showing which fences the LCDC erected and which were removed?
- (13) Which fencing by the LCDC has not been maintained and why?
- (14) Contrary to the answer given to question (9), I understand that the removal of fencing has provided unlimited access throughout the reserve whereas under the old system of segmented areas, the previous management could catch vandals. Why was this removed and what strategies are being used in its place?
- (15) Further to the answer given for question (11), who considered the earlier design adequate and who redesigned the fence?
- (16) Given that the upgrade is considered an insignificant financial burden has the substandard fencing been upgraded, and if not, does the Department intend to upgrade it?
- (17) Will the Minister investigate and advise Parliament of conditions placed on the development by the Australian Heritage Commission?

Hon TOM STEPHENS replied:

- (1) The figure of 64.9 represents the number of Department of Conservation and Land Management officer hours spent on community involvement and is not a dollar value.  
The figure of \$1094.99 is the salary figure calculated from the hours spent on community involvement by an officer of the Department of Conservation and Land Management at \$16.87 per hour.  
The figure of \$381.24 is an overhead figure charged on the salary cost.
- (2) The invoice to the developers for the fire unit is tabled. [See paper No 358.]
- (3) At the time of procurement of this vehicle it was not departmental policy to purchase light fleet vehicles. The vehicle was obtained under the standard government lease arrangements and the cost value of the vehicle was held in a trust account.
- (4) This question should be directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services.
- (5) The interest from funds held in trust accounts is placed into a holding account, unless otherwise identified in the contract. The Executive Director determines how these funds will be expended.
- (6) During 2002 there was only one fire within the Port Kennedy Scientific Park. The fire was extinguished by the Rockingham Station of the Fire and Rescue Service. They did not require assistance

- from the Baldvis Fire Station where the unit is currently held. The vehicle has been used to assist combat of 30 fires within the City of Rockingham.
- (7) The vehicle has been stationed at the Baldvis Fire Station since November 2001 and the golf course manager does not have access to it. Prior to this date, when the vehicle was housed at the golf course facility, the golf course supervisor utilised the vehicle for measuring the water monitoring bores within the Port Kennedy Scientific Park and to ensure the vehicle was running properly during the period outside the fire season.
- (8) The fire unit managed by the Department of Conservation and Land Management has been replaced on one occasion as is required under the lease arrangement. Both vehicles have been on a 36 month/60,000 kilometre lease arrangement. The kilometres travelled by each vehicle are:
- 1QAC 019 – 6,534 km up to 10 October 2001  
1QAE 422 – 3,929 km during the period 16 October 2001 to 16 September 2002
- (9) Yes, the vehicle has been used by departmental staff for fitting of a fire unit and kangaroo bar, purchasing replacement fire equipment and patrols and maintenance activities within the Port Kennedy Scientific Park in order to maintain vehicle running.
- (10) The interpretive shelter was installed during November 2001 near the junction of Rostellifera Break and the vermin-proof fence (a pedestrian access gate is located opposite the interpretive shelter). The location of the shelter has been shown on the updated Port Kennedy Scientific Park brochure produced and distributed during 2002.
- (11) 2001    3 dumped car bodies  
            70 metres of vermin-proof fence destroyed  
            5 BMX/motorbike jump circuits created within the park  
            damage to primary dunes (causing dune blow-outs) and damage to vegetation within the park by illegal vehicle access  
            metal objects thrown onto the top electric wire of the vermin-proof fence to short out the fence
- 2002    7 access control signs destroyed  
                 2 vehicle barrier gates destroyed  
                 28 metres of fencing damaged  
                 damage to vegetation through the construction of new tracks by vehicles  
                 vehicles driven over rehabilitated areas  
                 solar panel and battery stolen  
                 household rubbish dumped in the park  
                 vehicle access gate removed from vermin fence
- (12) The brochure shows the alignment of the vermin-proof fence and stock fence. In addition to the fencing shown on the brochure the Department of Conservation and Land Management has replaced the agricultural ringlock fence erected by the LCDC, in the foredunes and extends from the end of the new stock fence to Becher Point.
- (13) A vermin-proof fence on the southern and eastern boundary now encloses the boundary of the Port Kennedy Scientific Park. Stock fencing has been erected on part of the northern boundary to complement the current extent of the vermin-proof fence. The entire fence alignment whether erected by the LCDC or the Department, has been, and is currently, patrolled and maintained.
- The LCDC fence on the western boundary of the Scientific Park is not being maintained or replaced due to the natural erosion cycle of the beach south of Becher Point. Past LCDC fencing has been washed away during previous winter storms. This section of fencing is considered unnecessary as vehicles and motorcycles are excluded from the foreshore.
- (14) Removal of fencing has not provided unlimited access throughout the reserve.
- Only internal fencing, not essential in defining the reserve boundary or preventing feral animals from entering the reserve, has been removed.
- The entire boundary of the Port Kennedy Scientific Park is fenced from the south-western corner to the northern corner of Becher Point. Signs have been erected along the fence and adjacent to the two beach tracks to prevent vehicle and motorcycle access.
-

Vehicles and motorcycles are currently accessing the foreshore from the developer's land at the end of Port Kennedy Drive, through the City of Rockingham reserve to the beach north of Point Becher.

The current signage and fence alignment has allowed departmental staff to enforce the Conservation and Land Management Regulations with people who have illegally accessed the Port Kennedy Scientific Park.

- (15) The section of vermin-proof fence constructed by the original developer was considered adequate by the developer, but did not conform with the preferred departmental design, approved by the Port Kennedy Management Board. The original developer agreed to upgrade the fence to meet the departmental design but the work was not carried out.
- (16) The Department will initially negotiate with the new developer in regard to the upgrade of the substandard fence.
- (17) The Australian Heritage Commission cannot place conditions on a development. The Australian Heritage Commission's responsibility is to identify places for listing in the register of the national estate and to advise the Commonwealth Government on the protection of national estate places.