1. Esperance Tanker Jetty

The Esperance Tanker Jetty has previously been subject to an upper house petition, being Petition No. 129 of 2016, tabled by Hon Dave Grills MLC. The Shire requests that the Standing Committee refer to our submission of 24 November 2016 (and its attachment), which provides details of the Shire’s decision making process up to 6 December 2016.

Since our previous submission, the 42-day conservation order has be extended to an “ongoing” conservation order by former Minister for Heritage, Albert Jacobs (20 December 2016). This conservation order has subsequently being further endorsed by the current Minister, Hon. David Templeman MLC.

The Shire of Esperance, with the assistance of the Tanker Jetty Replacement Working Group developed key criteria for the replacement jetty, being:

   a. Located on the footprint of, or as near to as possible to the current Esperance Tanker Jetty
   b. Current curve be retained
   c. Longest possible jetty with a preferred length of 400 metres
   d. Minimum width of 3.5 metres
   e. A fish cleaning facility
   f. Meet relevant Australian standards

These criteria and a heritage impact statement was subsequently forwarded to Heritage Council of WA (HCWA), prior to developing a draft concept plan, who effectively endorsed the criteria and heritage impact, and requested the following points be considered:

   a. The incorporation of an in-situ section into the design of a new jetty;
   b. Ensure that the design of a replacement jetty provides a strong presence in the seascape;
   c. Consider the implementation of the Heritage Interpretation Plan for the Esperance Tanker Jetty in the design phase; and
   d. Ensure a suitably qualified heritage professional forms part of the design team.

From this advice and subsequent, informal discussions with HCWA and State Heritage Office, a preliminary concept design was developed based on Princes Pier redevelopment in Victoria, with the assistance of Hocking Heritage and GHD. This concept was subsequently not supported by the HCWA (8 September 2017), advising the Shire to consider the Busselton Jetty (a replacement jetty) and jetties from other jurisdictions in Australia. HCWA also requested a meeting with the Shire Council to discuss their advice and develop a shared understanding of a way forward. This requested meeting (workshop) occurred in Esperance on 28 September 2017.

Subsequent to the HCWA meeting on 8 September 2017, the Shire was made aware that at the HCWA meeting when the initial concept design was considered (8 September 2017), HCWA received a presentation from Hon. Peter Rundle MLA. The Shire understands this presentation was prepared by The Friends of Esperance Tanker Jetty Inc. In this presentation there are number of misleading and inaccurate statements, including:

1. The Shire has not investigated partial retention of the structure (The Council has considered the feasibility of restoring/reconstructing/retaining the jetty a number of times, according to Council published minutes and reports on our website);
2. The Shire made no response to an offer of funding from the former Minister for Regional Development all options for the jetty (this has subsequently been proven by local media, and by an investigation carried out by the Local Government Standards Panel, to be completely untrue);

3. The current demolition cost of the jetty is $2m (current demolition contract is $1.5m);

4. That Bonacci infrastructure could restore the jetty for $6m (Bonacci Infrastructure estimate is $7.1m);

5. The Replacement Jetty Working Group was set up and controlled by the Shire CEO (the CEO has no voting rights with either the Shire Council or the working group);

6. There are only three (3) significantly intact timber jetties in WA (the completely rebuilt Busselton jetty is of a timber, steel and concrete construction, with steel and concrete used in all significant structural components).

There seems to have been no attempt to verify any comments within this presentation with the Shire prior to it being presented to HCWA.

Since our last submission to the Standing Committee, the Jetty has suffered further deterioration. There has been a number of partial collapses, and debris is now being removed from the harbor on a regular basis. The Shire continues to monitor the jetty, and has provided all current condition reports and technical advice notices to all relevant state agencies and the community.

With respect to Mr Nieukerke's comments regarding the Esperance Tanker Jetty, please consider the following:

1. The Tanker Jetty was closed to the public in December 2015, as a result of a detailed Engineering report (available on the Shire's website), which concluded the jetty was no longer deemed to be safe. Since the jetty has been closed, advice from Australia's Golden Outback was been received indicating general tourism numbers have increased since 2015, which is supported by antidotal evidence supplied by local tourism providers and the local tourism industry organisation, Tourism Esperance. The Esperance Tourism market has resisted the WA trend by witnessing an increase in tourism numbers over the last few years.

2. The Shire agrees that a licence exists between the State of WA and the Shire of Esperance. Since the licence was entered into, the Shire has no record of any correspondence from the State of WA indicating that the Shire has breached its licence conditions. In fact, the Shire has managed to maintain the jetty, for 25 years, without any additional financial assistance from the State Government, other than the initial $150,000 when the licence was entered into. Furthermore, had the Shire not entered into this licence, it is more than likely the State Government would had demolished the Jetty, as it no longer served any commercial purpose for the Port of Esperance and had already exceeded its design life by some 20 years, resulting in escalating maintenance costs to the Port.

3. On 8 November 2016 the Esperance Shire Council considered a petition by the Jetty Group Inc, being, "We the undersigned, support a re-evaluation of the Esperance Shire Council's decision to demolish the Historic Tanker Jetty." A review of the petition indicates the following:

   a. Petition contained 6988 individual entries;

   b. 1820 entries were either unidentifiable or incomplete;
c. 1765 entries were identified as being non Esperance residents;
d. Of the remaining 3403 entries identified as Esperance residents or ratepayers, there were a number of multiple entries from the same individuals (1 individual signed the petition 9 times), a number of entries are believed to be from underage individuals (school children), and there were a number of entries signed on behalf of other individuals (proxies).
e. Only 3044 entries have been identified as accurate entries.

This petition could not be accepted by Council, as it did not meet the requirements for a petition under the Council’s Standing Order Local Law 2015. The Council did however accept the petition as an indication of community and regional interest in the Esperance Tanker Jetty. At the same meeting, Council resolved that:

"...the report presented to Council by the Jetty Group Inc, including the Bonacci Report, does not represent a prudent and feasible alternative and continue with the demolition and replacement of the Esperance Tanker Jetty." (S1116-035).

4. Since 2015, the Shire has only received two (2) proposals from proponents to either save, restore or reconstruct the Esperance Jetty, being:


b. Davey Hydraulics Esperance Tanker Jetty Restoration (2017), with a cost estimate of "less than $6m". This report has not been made public, as it is the property of the Friends of Esperance Tanker Jetty Inc, who have chosen not to allow the Esperance community to scrutinise the proposal. Mr. Ken Davey, Principle of Davey Hydraulics is a qualified Diesel Mechanic, who has worked on various South Australian jetties under the direction of the South Australian Government.

Both reports have been reviewed by experienced WA based marine engineers and deemed to be under-scoped, based on unrealistic assumptions and underpriced. Both proposals would introduce new design features to the existing jetty, bringing into question whether either proposal would meet the definitions of either restoration or reconstruction, as defined in the Burra Charter. Neither proposal has been reviewed by a heritage expert nor have they received (to our knowledge) any support from the Heritage Council of WA (HCWA).

5. Prior to the current conservation order being placed by the Former Minister for Heritage, the Shire of Esperance accepted a tender for demolition of the jetty for $1.5m (S1116-037); this agreement currently remains in place. The acceptance of this tender was widely publicised at the time, and the comment that demolition will cost up to $4m is completely inaccurate and misleading. The current tender requires the contractor to salvage as much material as possible for reuse (not for structural purposes) and the Shire retains ownership of all removed material.

6. After a workshop involving the Shire of Esperance Council and representatives of the HCWA (28 October 2017), HCWA publically stated they would support either of the below options:
a. Option one is reconstruction of the existing structure based on the 1935 design, potentially using old and new material. If this is not feasible then;

b. Option two is replacement using a more contemporary design driven by heritage values constructed with new and recycled materials.

The Shire subsequently issued a Request for Quote (RFQ) to three (3) heritage experts recommended by the Heritage Council of WA to determine whether reconstruction was feasible. At a Special Meeting of Council held on 7 November 2017, after reviewing the RFQ’s received:

"Council determined that a reconstruction to 512m is not a “prudent and feasible” option given the information provided in the RFQ, and given the reports collated, advice the Heritage Council [of WA] accordingly and seek their feedback.” (S1117-288).

In response to the Council’s decision not to progress with reconstruction, the Chair of the Heritage Council of WA advised the Shire:

"The Heritage Council notes the Shire’s resolution that the reconstruction of the 1935 jetty design is neither feasible nor prudent.

The [Heritage] Council also notes that the Shire has resolved to request quotes for the development of a replacement jetty the design of which will be informed by a heritage architect, in line with the agreement reached at our 28 September workshop." Anne Arnold, HCWA Chair, 28 November 2017.

Since this correspondence the Shire has not received any other conflicting advice from either the HCWA or the Minister for Heritage and has subsequently engaged a Heritage Architect, H+H Architects to lead a design team for a replacement jetty, at a tendered price of $334,800 ex GST ($368,280 GST inclusive). The Shire has recently released a Draft Concept Plan for a replacement jetty, developed by H+H Architects for community feedback, which closes on 21 September 2018. This Draft Concept Plan has already received in principle support from HCWA.

7. The Shire of Esperance has not received any grant funding associated with Stage 3 of the Foreshore Redevelopment Project (Esperance Tanker Jetty) and all funds received for Stages 1 and 2 has been fully acquitted with the relevant funding agencies.

8. According to Council’s financial records, the following is a summary of the costs that have been allocated to the Esperance Tanker Jetty, since 1990:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tanker Jetty Costs 1990-2018</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>627,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Maintenance</td>
<td>294,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Assessments (marine surveys)</td>
<td>212,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave Studies</td>
<td>85,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetty Designs</td>
<td>117,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetty Debris Removal</td>
<td>345,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,682,971</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with all Local Governments, the Shire of Esperance financials are independently audited on an annual basis.
9. According to the Esperance Tjaljraak Native Title Aboriginal Corporation RNTB (ETNTAC), who represents the interests of the registered local Native Title Holders, they have not been consulted or provided any advice to the principle petitioner regarding the significance of the Jetty to local aboriginal people. Advice the Shire has received from ETNTAC is that:

"In summary, all of the Elders we consulted expressed a desire for jetty to be available for use by the public but there were no statements in relation to the cultural significance of the current jetty in its current form." And;

"At this stage... none of our members have brought our attention to any particular cultural heritage values associated with the jetty that require ETNTAC's consideration."

The Shire has formally invited ETNTAC to provide feedback on the current Draft Concept Design, who have advised they would like their connection to country to be recognised in important public places such as the replacement jetty (email has been attached for reference).
2. Proposed Merivale Landfill

The Shire of Esperance is committed to providing a Waste Management Facility that exceeds current best practice in both design and operation. All Councillors and staff live and work in this community and are committed to providing essential services and facilities whilst protecting our natural assets and economic stability, this is a role that is taken very seriously.

The Shire of Esperance has been searching for a new landfill site since 2004 when the Department of Environment informed the Shire that the current Landfill site was deemed to be unsuitable for a landfill. Over a period of time, the Shire undertook due diligence investigations on numerous sites without success. Please see the attached timeline for more a detailed explanation of this process.

In 2012 the Shire engaged Cardno BSD to prepare a Future Waste Disposal Strategy to identify the best option for waste disposal into the future. This report identified a regional facility as the best option, however if there was no interest in a regional facility then the best option became a new site with lined cells.

Subsequently, the Shire engaged Talis Consultants to undertake a Site Selection Study on Crown and Shire controlled land. This study identified a preferred site, however due to native title considerations access to undertake due diligence tests could not occur for a significant period of time. The Shire then targeted privately held land whereby timeframes were reduced and sellers could nominate their properties as potential locations for a landfill site. These two studies ensured that over 50 parcels of land were reviewed by the Shire.

Lot 12 Kirwan Road is the third site that has been the subject of intrusive on-site investigations. Both the previous two sites were shown to be environmentally unsuitable for a modern waste facility and on that basis alone, were abandoned by the Shire.

Much of this preliminary information has already been provided to the Standing Committee, via the Shire’s response to Petition 304 of 2017, tabled by Hon. Colin de Grussa MLA, 15 June 2017. The Shire would encourage the Standing Committee to review our response and submissions from various Ministers to this earlier petition.

This approach has been supported by the Federal Minister to the Environment, Hon Melissa Price, who in her previous role stated on ABC Goldfields Esperance radio:

"Certainly it was good today to hear from the Council that this is the third site that they have looked at. So they haven't just chosen one site and just gone ahead with it, so I think that was very comforting to hear that from the Council".

[9 August 2018]

She also stated in the same interview that:

"The Council is going about it in a very systematic and very reasonable way, in that the particular project has now been given a PER approval rating which means that it will be a very long form process so they are not trying to cut corners, I was very pleased to hear that today".

It is also important to note that three independent consultants have undertaken works in relation to the site and each one has indicated that the site is suitable for a modern waste management facility.

In order to minimise risk to the environment, the Shire is also well advanced in various improvements to our waste activities. One example is a project to divert all organic waste from landfill and process it through composting. This will provide the residents of Esperance with approximately 6,000 to 8,000 tonnes of high quality compost, which is a significant improvement on sending this material to landfill.
In summary, there is no basis for a claim of mismanagement or wasted funds in this complex project. The process followed to date, has been rigorous and transparent and will result in the shire’s next waste disposal site being in an environmentally sustainable location for many decades.

Below is a tabulation of the claims made by the petitioners and the Shire of Esperance' response:

1. The proposed landfill facility is located at Lot 12 Kirwan Road, Merivale and not Merivale Road as indicated.

2. The site selection process that led to purchase of this site included assessing over 50 Crown, Shire and Freehold sites through a multi-criteria analysis considering 16 separate criteria. Lot 12 Kirwan Road score ranked 4th on the freehold sites within the Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) process. It is not correct to say the decision to purchase the site was based on one aspect of the analysis.

3. The proposed cell locations are not within the catchment of a protected wetland.

4. Key data within the hydrogeological models has been independently reviewed and provides Council, the community, the EPA and the DWER with the highest level of confidence in the process being followed. This is not in any way an unusual process for this type of development. The review recommended some further works be undertaken to ascertain the aquifer properties and stated:

   "we have identified no hydrogeological fatal flaws that would otherwise prevent this site from use as a waste management facility", PenningtonScott, 2018.

   Council has subsequently engaged another independent hydrogeological and environmental consultant (Rockwater) to perform a "pump test" on the site to clarify ground water flow velocity. Their result clearly indicates ground water flow to be 39m per year and therefore it would take 41 years for any contaminated ground water to leave the property. This timeframe provides ample time for any ground water contamination from the cells to be identified and resolved before escaping from the property.

5. Talis’s Due Diligence and Landfill Capability Assessment (March 2017) does not state it would take 579 years for contaminated ground water to leave Lot 12 Kirwan Road. Under Section 5 – Hydrogeological Risk Assessment (Page 21) of this report, Talis has estimated it would take over 400 years for contaminated ground water to leave the property, based on a “Darcey’s seepage velocity rate” of 2.59m/year. Based on this report, Council resolved to purchase Lot 12 Kirwan Road at a Special Meeting of Council on 14 April 2017 (S0417-061). 579 years is not mentioned in the actual due diligence report, but is however mentioned in Talis’s Phase 1 – Hydrogeological Investigation (June 2017) received after the decision to purchase the property. This was based on initial “slug test” results, which is acknowledged not be as accurate as a “pump test” (which has subsequently been performed), however is able to be used as an initial indicator of possible ground water issues.

The Shire also notes comments from the Minister for Environment in response to the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs, (6 October 2017), relating to Petition no. 14/2017 which states:
"The DWER's Principal Hydrogeologist has calculated that under a scenario where there is an absence of interconnected karst-like features between the site and the groundwater discharge area (the escarpment), groundwater travel times are expected to lie in the range of about 66 to 347 years...".

It should be noted that developing a Waste Facility is an investigative process. As more and more information and data is collected, the Shire's better understanding of the site and location will enable the most appropriate control methods to introduce and mitigate any possible environment or social impact from the facility.

6. Council decision to seek a PER is based on the desire to ensure the proposal was subjected to the most rigorous independent scrutiny that is appropriate so the community can be confident the environmental values of the area would be protected. The same process would be appropriate whichever site was selected.

7. It is correct to say that the EPA approval process could take two years, however this is not a Shire process and therefore the shire has no control over this timing. It should be noted that the same timeframe would apply to any other site that was assessed in the same way.

8. Until the Environmental Scoping Document (EPA) is finalised, the actual costs of the PER process in unknown. However, based on the current version of the document, the additional cost of the PER is approximately $60,000. This is essentially an unavoidable cost as the Shire and members of the public requested the EPA undertake the highest level of assessment for this property, which would include a full PER.

9. To date, all works associated with this process have been drawn from Council's Sanitation Reserve funds and are not in any way related to the current rates increase as claimed. The Sanitation Reserve has been funded by surplus money raised within the waste area over previous years and a waste rate, which was introduced in 2013/14, knowing that developing a waste facility to meet current standards would be an expensive exercise (regardless of location). The current estimated capital cost of the new facility is $7.9m, while the waste rate (also called a levy) generates around $600k per annum.

10. The claim that ratepayers will be required to carry the ever increasing costs of placing a landfill in an inappropriate location is false. Three separate hydrogeology assessments by independent consultants have concluded that there are no fatal flaws to be encountered in developing a landfill on the proposed site. The Shire acknowledges that if the site is proven to be inappropriate the EPA and DWER will not grant the respective approvals; to date no evidence has been received supporting the claim the site is inappropriate.

11. The purchase of Lot 12 Kirwan Road was executed by Council following an extensive four month due diligence investigation involving significant consultation with State Government Agencies, Federal Department of Environment and Energy and on ground intrusive investigations. The investigations included monitoring bore installation, lab tests on soils, test pits, flora/fauna surveys and an Ecologist report. Some of the costs quoted are accurate. Some are not and cannot be explained from
any recorded expenditure made by the Shire. The fact remains however that there has not been any “misadventure”.

The Shire of Esperance has embarked on a thorough process of due diligence that saw two sites abandoned when it was proven that the hydrology or geology of the sites was unsuitable. The site in Dalyup was purchased by a neighbor after the Shire’s on-site investigation identified unacceptable environmental risks. The Shire purchased Lot 12 Kirwan Road for approximately $4,360 per hectare. A neighboring (cleared farmland) property was recently sold for over $6,000 per hectare (including improvements). The purchase of Lot 12 Kirwan Road has been investigated by the Department of Local Government, who has determined that no malpractice or misappropriation has occurred.

12. Provisions for the development of the landfill facility have been incorporated in Council’s long term financial plan, and appropriately reflect the anticipated cost of constructing a modern waste disposal facility to meet the highest environmental standards and the legislative requirements for such a facility.

Site conditions and associated risks have not caused additional constructions costs, the proposed design of the facility has not required altering to cater for any environmental risk. And in fact, there are substantial financial benefits to purchasing this site as the standing plantation will greatly reduce the cost of visual screening and the cost of clearing and preliminary site works will be off-set by the proceeds of selling the timber currently over the proposed site footprint.

13. The Shire Council and the administration have followed a transparent process for the management of this complex multi-million dollar project. It has taken every prudent measure to ensure the environmental and social values of this area and other investigated sites were protected and it has voluntarily subjected the project to the highest level of scrutiny by requesting the EPA to undertake a Public Environmental Review. All information associated with the project is publically available on the Shire of Esperance website. www.esperance.wa.gov.au/current-project-information
3. Indoor Sports Stadium Upgrade Project

The Esperance Indoor Sports Stadium (ISS) upgrade is an extremely positive and highly anticipated project for the Shire of Esperance. Until the shire received notice of Petition 069, where the conduct of the Shire of Esperance was highlighted as a concern, we had not received any negative comments regarding this project.

The Esperance Greater Sports Ground (GSG) has a three (3) court basketball stadium and associated buildings (including a building known as the Noel White Pavilion) that have been built and upgraded over the last 30 plus years. In 2013, an Indoors Sports Stadium Feasibility Study indicated that four (4) courts would meet the future needs of the Esperance community. Since this report the Shire has been working with Stadium stakeholders on how to implement the recommendations within this study.

A stakeholders group was formed to assist in the development of plans for the ISS upgrade, this groups includes representation from:

- Esperance Indoor Sports Stadium Management Committee (manages the ISS on behalf of the Shire of Esperance and made up from ISS user groups)
- Esperance Agricultural Society
- Esperance Basketball Association
- Esperance Junior Basketball Committee
- Esperance Netball Association
- Esperance & District Badminton Association
- Esperance Soccer Association
- Esperance Volleyball Association

Initially it was thought an additional court could be added to the existing stadium. A structural report, received in July 2016, indicated various structural issues associated with the current ISS, which meant an alternative option needed to be found. After several meetings with ISS stakeholders, it was agreed to pursue a new three (3) court stadium. The Shire’s initial application to the Goldfields Esperance Revitalisation fund (GERF) was subsequently amended and business case developed.

In August 2016, the Esperance Shire Council approved an application for a CSRFF Forward Planning Grant. Ultimately the Shire was successful with both applications, receiving $4.06m from the Goldfields Esperance Revitalisation Fund (a RfR funding stream) and $723k from CSRFF.

Council has resolved to fund the balance of the $7,827,398 project, which equates to just over $3m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RfR</td>
<td>4,060,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRFF</td>
<td>723,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire of Esperance</td>
<td>3,044,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Value</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,827,398</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project is broken up to two (2) stages, being:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 New Indoor Courts</td>
<td>7,247,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Refurbishment of the Noel White Pavilion</td>
<td>580,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Project Value</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,827,398</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both stages are required to be implemented according to the Shire's Financial Assistance Agreement with the State of WA.

The project has progressed from concept design to detailed design; construction tenders are expected to be issued in October 2018, as the overall funding for the project has now been secured.

During the entire design phase, all stakeholder and user groups were consulted to ensure their specific group or sporting needs were met. Many of these meetings had representation from the Goldfields Esperance Development Commission (GEDC). To our knowledge, the petitioner, Mr Nieukerke, is not a member of any of the stakeholder groups, nor has he raised any concerns directly with Council over the project.

Attached to this submission is a letter from the Chair of the Esperance Indoor Sport Stadium Management Committee (EISSMC), Mr Graham Mackenzie. Mr Mackenzie's letter clearly refutes the claims made by Mr Nieukerke. The Shire is completely unaware where Mr Nieukerke has sourced his information from and the claims made in this instance, should be seen as a blatant attempt to discredit the Shire of Esperance by making false and misleading statements.

Though the Shire of Esperance believes Mr Mackenzie's letter speaks for itself we would like the following points to be considered:

1. The Shire received notification of a funding commitment for the Esperance Indoor Sports Stadium project from Hon. Alannah MacTiernan Minister for Regional Development on 18 October 2017. The Royalties for Regions Financial Assistance Agreement funding agreement executed is for a new three court indoor sports stadium and the refurbishment of the Noel White Pavilion (which houses the Esperance Agricultural Society).

2. The structural issues with the current indoors sports stadium were first identified while the Shire was undertaking the design of the previous upgrade proposal that would have added an additional court to the current Indoor Sports Stadium. The structural analysis undertaken by an independent engineer revealed that the building was well under the acceptable structural capacity. A spend of over $850,000 would have been required to bring the current building up to a level that would only be just acceptable for the upgrade of an additional court. Further to this, the engineering analysis recommended closing and sealing the facility when wind speeds are expected to be over 90km/h as this is the acceptable safe level. The Shire has implemented this management practice, which all stakeholder and user groups are aware of. The Structural Engineering Report has been linked for your reference.

3. To state there has been no consultation between the Shire of Esperance and the Esperance Agricultural Society is a complete untruth. All affected user groups and stakeholders were consulted regarding progress of Esperance Indoor Sports Stadium project, at the following meetings:

a. 19 July 2016 – User Group meeting held to discuss the Structural Report received and possible options going forward (Esperance Agricultural Society in attendance);

b. 27 July 2016 - User Group meeting held to discuss proposed Concept design for new three court stadium (Esperance Agricultural Society in attendance);

c. 12 August 2016 – EISSMC Meeting regarding letter of support for CSRFF and GERF Funding application (Esperance Agricultural Society in attendance);
d. 8 March 2017 – GSG Redevelopment Committee (shire committee) Meeting on ISS upgrade (Esperance Agricultural Society is a member of this committee);

e. 26 February 2018 – ISS stakeholders and user group meeting on stadium concept plans (Esperance Agricultural Society in attendance); and

f. 13 August 2018 – ISS stakeholders and user group meeting on stadium detail design (Esperance Agricultural Society in attendance).

4. There are currently no plans or decisions made to demolish the current Indoor Sports Stadium. Given the structural report into the Indoor Sports Stadium being significantly under capacity, a long term solution will need to be found, with multiple options to consider. These options will be discussed with all user groups and stakeholders before a recommendation is made to Council.