

Town of Port Hedland



PILBARA'S PORT CITY GROWTH FORUM

WORKSHOPS #2

MEETING NOTES

Council Chamber, Town Port Hedland and Civic
Centre

6 and 7 June 2011

Prepared by WorleyParsons
Daniel Marsh



INTRODUCTION

Town of Port Hedland hosted a two-day stakeholder workshop on 6 and 7 July 2011 as a key milestone in the development of the Pilbara's Port City Growth Plan. The Growth Forum was intended to be the key opportunity for stakeholder involvement prior to publication of the draft document. The forum built on a series of key theme focus groups held in Port Hedland during the week-commencing 20 June 2011.

Purpose of the Workshop

The Pilbara's Port City Growth Forum provided opportunity for government agencies, the private sector and community organisations to review key elements of the growth plan and provide feedback on options presented. The key objective was to receive early advice on any fatal flaws, major gaps or significant differences of opinion on the strategic directions being developed.

Workshop Format

The forum took place over two days during business hours with 'work-in-progress' summary sessions held in the evenings of both days. The timing of the core sessions was designed to accommodate the expected attendance of primarily government agencies and business organisations. The evening sessions were designed as compressed summaries of the day's key discussion points and were aimed more towards lay people in the community.

Information and discussion was structured in 19 sessions and a copy of the agenda accepted by participants on Day 1 forms Annex 1. The focus before morning tea on Day 1 was on setting the context and after the break reactions were sought to non-spatial enabling strategies (economic development, infrastructure provision and community facilities). After lunch on Day 1, the focus turned to the review of draft precinct plans and stakeholders had the opportunity to work in small groups to modify and mark up plans. The focus of Day 2 was on testing the approach that was to be used to develop the implementation plan by presenting a specimen treatment of one precinct.

This record is structured to follow the agenda and captures key points of stakeholder discussion and can be read together with consultants' presentations.

DAY ONE

SESSION #1 – 3 WORKSHOP STRUCTURE AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

The workshop commenced with a short presentation setting context including the relationship of Pilbara's Port City Growth Plan to 'Hedland's Future Today' and 'Heading Forward', the ToPH Strategic Plan 2010-2015. An agenda to guide the workshop was accepted and an overview provided of the growth plan planning process.



SESSION #4: CITY CHARACTERISTICS

Presenters:

Mark Wallace:	Economic Development, Population Growth Challenges & Affordability
Daniel Marsh:	Quality of life
Craig Lovering:	Sense of Place and Amenity
Jermayne Fabling:	Infrastructure Capacity Issues
Ben Hollyoak:	Heritage and Environmental Issues

Session Objectives and Process

The purpose of this session was to validate the consultant team understanding of the key issues with a broad base of stakeholders – including qualification of key issues raised at during the key theme focus groups held w/c 20 June 2011. This session allowed all stakeholders to be brought up to a common minimum level of understanding of the existing situation by reviewing the opportunities and constraints facing Port Hedland.

The reporting of the key points of this discussion is broken into four subsections:

- Economic Development, Property and Affordability
- Quality of Life, Place-making & Community Facilities
- Infrastructure Capacity
- Environmental Constraints

Stakeholder Response

Economic Development, Property and Affordability

Key points of presentation:

- Population is polarised: high levels of economic prosperity and high socio-economic disadvantage.
- Virtual mono-economy of the resources sector.
- Critical housing affordability, the situation impacts all aspects of town life.
- A young population and increasing birth rates are placing further pressures on infrastructure and child services.
- Future population growth will be significantly influenced by availability and affordability of residential accommodation, retail and industrial premises.

Poor housing affordability underpinned discussion on economic development (as opposed to economic growth). It was pointed out that not only is accommodation of transient workers an urgent issue for the resources sector, but the resources sector demand for temporary accommodation crowds out temporary accommodation in which to place housing construction workers. Without fly-in, fly-out accommodation for the housing construction sector, few additional dwellings will be created and the affordability situation will deteriorate further. Frustration was expressed with a planning process that had failed to deliver action on the ground and the need for short-term 'wins' in the Pilbara's Port City Growth Plan.

Clarification was sought regarding consultants' understanding of local construction categories / needs such as traditional homes, company housing, units and hotel/temporary.



Stakeholders recognised the tension between addressing the short-term crisis in affordable accommodation and ensuring long-term liveability through quality of development and housing stock. A view was expressed that it is important to ensure the town is built as an attractive place for people to live in the longer term and to avoid leaving a negative legacy by building less expensive housing to meet short term demand.

“The issues of housing are linked to the labour market and how we build this town for the longer term will in part determine how many families move here”

There was a view that lack of secondary education choices are a break on economic diversity. Education was linked to affordability with lack of accommodation for teachers affecting education outcomes and having a direct influence on both the number of people moving into the town and the length of time families remained in the town.

“New people coming to town want to know the options for high school for their children and this is an issue. Even if we did have options for high school, we can't attract the teachers as there isn't any housing”

Quality of Life, Place Making and Community Facilities

Key points of presentation:

- Community surveys show improving scores for satisfaction with quality of life – reflecting recent townscape / service improvements.
- Current heritage and amenity assets in the Town of Port Hedland can be built upon to create structure and spaces to attract people to a place where they want to live in, walk around and enjoy. A sample treatment of street-scaping was presented noting opportunities for passive and active exercise and the programming of community events.

Clarification was sought about the range of natural and heritage features consultants had considered in planning. This was confirmed by the group as: the coastline; aviation history; parks; industrial features such as ships, trains, the salt farm; Pretty Pool, Four Mile Creek and Six Mile; Finucane Island; and Cemetery Beach.

Opening up access to the coastline in Port with coastal path and perhaps an esplanade road was widely supported.

“We need to celebrate the natural elements of the landscape”

A reaction to the presentation of two-dimensional plans was noting of the opportunity of ocean views from the East End and provision of vertical relief.

“The best thing in Sutherland Street is to look down on the coastline”

Recent improvements in the town such as tree planting, streetscape upgrades, court house gallery and club refurbishments were acknowledged and the vision as a connected, liveable place with local centres and walkable destinations was seen as consistent with local community values. Strong emphasis by stakeholders was placed on the need to ensure connectivity between Port and South Hedland.





“A huge issue to address is the connectivity between Port and South Hedland and we need to be careful not to create two separate areas. It is about connecting the town and different precincts”

Infrastructure Capacity

Key Points of Presentation:

- Water supply – aquifers currently near limit of capacity and allocations are being juggled; future development work at existing bore-fields (Yule, DeGrey rivers) may provide additional short-term supply but medium-term supply is dependent on feasibility of lower grade water from the West Canning Basin replacing potable water currently being used by industry
- Power – currently operating at capacity and needs to be expanded in order to meet future development requirements

Current water/energy limits were acknowledged as acute constraints with water allocations in particular the product of a complex regulatory environment. A view was expressed that the Growth Plan should not simply accept limitation of current government processes, but should rather explore the political will to fast-track approval processes.

Similarly, a view was expressed that government agency capital works program budgets should be reviewed to bring forward commissioning of critical infrastructure (such as the relocation of the Port Hedland wastewater treatment plant scheduled for commissioning in 2014).

Environmental Constraints

Key points of Presentation:

- Future planning and development in the West End is to meet dust/noise requirements outlined in Dust Taskforce recommendations.
- Environmental issues that limit the area of developable land include flood zone, strategic industrial area buffer zones, water availability and coastal processes.

The group acknowledged the outlined constraints. It was noted that FMG railway line buffer should be shown on plans.



SESSION #5 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & PROPERTY

Presenters: Mark Wallace, Michael Campbell

Session Objectives and Process

An analysis of opportunities and gaps in the Port Hedland economy and property markets was presented covering population growth, housing needs, retail and commercial and economic development.

The following strategies were presented:

- Diversify the economy by building on current successes and comparative advantages rather than something completely new – mining will continue to be a significant asset to the town but additional value-adding (even into other mining regions) will make the local economy more resilient to downturns
- Aggressively target diversification into related industries and sharpen understanding of competitive advantage over time
- Growth in retail, manufacturing professional services and transport sectors represent opportunities for reducing reliance on mining
- Overcome infrastructure delays that are critical barriers to diversification by acting on the distorted housing market
- Develop housing strategies to promote affordability which may include:
 - Establish and promote a strategic land bank to allow orderly release of land and alter perceptions of future land shortages
 - Restrict residential heights to reduce housing costs
 - Use townhouses to increase population density and affordability
 - Avoid impediments to long-term redevelopment by separating strata housing from commercial office/retail uses (especially relevant in West End)
 - Increase area of developable land by designing housing for flood recovery
 - Shared equity schemes to encourage longer stays (European university experience)
 - Provision of adequate retail/commercial and industrial floor area to overcome a critical barrier to growth and diversification

An economic development framework was presented outlining potential solutions to key issues.

Stakeholder Response

Economic Diversification

Economic diversification (as opposed to more growth) was accepted as the way to secure a more sustainable economic future for the town. There was general acceptance that growth opportunities are likely to involve clusters of businesses in mining supply, professional services, residential services and transport/logistics. There was also some support for the growth potential of manufacturing, national defence and tourism sectors.

There was uncertainty about what body would actually drive economic diversity strategies with some support for Office of Pilbara Cities taking on the role with appropriate resources.



The potential was raised for agriculture (and especially hydroponics and fish farming) to address the poor availability of fresh food, reduce 'food miles', generate export income and create employment. The advice of the consultants is this sector would most likely have a role in supply local markets rather than become a large scale export industry.

The opportunity to attract a significant Dept of Defence presence was clarified and short-term lobbying actions of the Town of Port Hedland summarised.

Stakeholders requested the Growth Plan address the appropriate degree of competition and collaboration with Karratha by indicating potential regional development initiatives and what strategies would be Port-Hedland-centric.

Similarly, caution was urged in 'splitting' regional government facilities between Port Hedland and Karratha. Placement of regional facilities in one or other of the towns (on the assumption that they are then accessible to residents/businesses in either town) had not worked well in the past.

"We don't want to go down the track of developing Karratha and Hedland as twin cities. The government previously focussed on growing both towns together but this lead to a dilution of both"

Specific pressures on small business and uncertainties (eg online retailing, big box retail concentration) were overviewed with employee housing again being a key issue. There was a view that flexibility in land use arrangements (so as to allow homes over shops) was required to allow retail growth.

Housing Affordability:

The recurring theme of accommodation permeated all areas of discussion and stakeholders agreed that critical to development is the resolution of housing issues in the next 1 – 2 years. Group discussion focussed primarily on developing strategies to meet short term housing demands and infrastructure needs. Priority was placed on resolving infrastructure issues.

"We don't have housing crisis, we have an infrastructure crisis. The next three years are critical to development of the town"

"The simplest solution is to provide serviced lots. Many people in the town can afford to build their own house but we need serviced lots. There is a need for serviced lots to be made available for purchase"

Utilising sites which are land banked or under tenure of local and state government were viewed as vital in assisting to alleviate the current housing shortage. Specific infill development opportunities over the next 12 months were identified on plans. There was support for the strategy of developing a long-term land bank but not at the expense of short-term action on lot releases.

The roles of Office of the Pilbara Cities, Regional Planning Committee of WA Planning Commission and Infrastructure Coordinating Committees were raised as appropriate vehicles for the fast-tracking of statutory approvals and capital works programs.

There were some reservations about the provision of affordable permanent housing.



“If the option is to put up cheap housing in, this will cause problems for the future. We need to build quality housing in Hedland”

Stakeholders noted the limitations of share equity schemes and Federal Government landlord subsidies in addressing housing affordability while rents were so high. However, the value of shared equity in building place-attachment was recognised and the FMG experience noted. FMG have housing tenure options that allow operational workers to build equity in their home and tends to promote retention of families in town. It was noted that few major contractors had similar arrangements in place for resident workers.

SESSION #6 COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Presenter: Daniel Marsh

Session Objectives and Process

Concurrent with Session 8, a small working group looked at Communities Facilities in more detail. Using the table of comparative analysis of community facilities in regional cities as a base, the group brainstormed key medium and long-term gaps in facilities – assets that will be required in the future to achieve the levels of amenity implied in the Pilbara Cities vision.

Using a ‘MoSCoW’ analysis, participants placed facilities on a timeline for delivery between 2011 and 2035 with the objective being the uncovering of differences in perceived need and expectations for quick wins.

The MoSCoW snapshot analysis assigns potential projects into one of four categories of desirability:

1. Must Have – the initiative or project is an essential part of the proposed program
2. Should Have – the project is supported but not considered essential
3. Could Have - the project would add some value but the case is not compelling
4. Will Not Have – the project or initiative is not desired and should not form part of proposed program

The results of the MoSCoW analysis (see figure 1) illustrate the challenges of managing expectations during periods of rapid growth and the need for regular reviews of major facility planning against emerging community needs. Participants also noted that it is the quality of the facility (rather than provision of a facility per se), the programs offered and the place activation strategies adopted that will improve quality of life in Port Hedland.



Figure 1: Stakeholder Response: MoSCoW Analysis

		2011 – 2015	2015 – 2020	2020+
M	<i>Must Have</i>	Key worker accommodation Crematorium Cemetery Beach Memorial Garden BMX Track Skate Park Specialist Rooms (Cancer, Dentist, Obstetrician, Paediatrician). Markets Library Public Hall Artist Space	Student Transitional Housing for work and university Government shop front co-located in centre	
O				
S	<i>Should Have</i>	Cinema University for central excellence Family Day-care Relocate civic centre to South Hedland and utilise space for community	Resource Recovery centre Basic camp facilities at Condon/bustop and Titchulla	Dog Park Aged Day Care Lit Ovals Boat Ramp at Spoil bank
C	<i>Could Have</i>	Community Garden Expanded lotteries	Public Fitness Prison Recycling Centre Long daycare	Museum
O				
W	<i>Won't Have</i>	Anymore 25 metre swimming pools.		



Some other themes to emerge from this discussion were:

- The quality and nature of facilities is an important consideration in growth planning. Beyond, the initial provision of a facility, it is clear expectations will develop that facilities will improve in quality and amenity over time. It was suggested that (a) high quality facilities should be favoured over 'medium-term' solutions and (b) spatial planning should allow for potential expansion/redevelopment of key facilities.
- Maintenance costs and burden on ratepayers needs to be factored in decisions on capital investment on community facilities
- The community infrastructure priorities identified by Regional Development Australia (Interim Pilbara Plan, April 2011) requires further feasibility and needs analysis.

SESSION #7 INFRASTRUCTURE

Presenters: Jermayne Fabling/Filipe Vieira

Session Objectives and Process

A short presentation outlining key infrastructure issues and possible solutions were presented to the group. Stakeholders were invited to comment and suggested additional strategies by building on others ideas in a large group format.

Stakeholder Response/Ideas

Additional Water Supply

- An ongoing program to reduce industry water use and substitute non-potable water use to free up scheme water for growth
- Explore option of using treated ballast water from returning ships for dust suppression / appropriate grade use
- 'Water Factory' wastewater centrally collected from various sources to be treated and redistributed for appropriate grade reuse

Water Reuse

- Need to be aware of over reliance on grey water available for re-use as peaks and troughs in consumption (absences over Christmas holidays) will influence water availability for re-use.

Water Demand Management

- Demand management (power/water) – to be achieved through companies rather than individuals. Links between use/cost to be made to reduce consumption.
- Portion of employer housing allowance to be allocated only to power/water efficient products.

Additional Power Supply

- Port Hedland has abundant solar energy resources; town planning scheme should mandate solar hot water systems, protect against overshadowing of residential photovoltaic systems; and grant development bonuses to industrial sheds using PV collectors
- Done well, high use of renewable energy was viewed as good for the image or 'brand' for the town as progressive, innovative and adopting of new technology.
- Waste water to energy – there is potential for energy generation from waste water treatment plant





SESSION #8 CITY STRATEGY – OVERVIEW OF PRECINCTS, REVIEW AND FEEDBACK

Presenters: Filipe Vieira/Neil Thom/Rod Dixon

Session Objectives and Process

Precinct concept drawings and objectives/strategies were presented to the group outlining key objectives for each of the precincts. Participants were divided into groups to discuss and review each concept and provide feedback to consultants.

Stakeholder Response

West End

- Caravan Park not best use of marina
- Walkability strategy needs to address climate / provision of shade.
- Mixed use supported
- Too much retail may undermine historic values of the area.
- Need back up plan for activation if marina does not go ahead.
- Use of hospital as housing construction worker temporary accommodation was canvassed but found not possible as building not safe and due for demolition.

East End

- Support for East End as significant growth area including a retail centre
- Preserve mangroves and natural attractions of area and avoid lengthy environmental approval process.
- Support for coastal path.
- Concerns were raised regarding turtles and need for low rise/low light on shoreline.
- Option of moving commercial centre directly onto coast was discussed but not favoured.
- Support for district sporting area in East End. Need to be aware of potential requirements for buffer due to railway.

South Hedland

- Western entry road needs signature consistent with brand.
- South Hedland waste water treatment plant should be aligned to avoid buffer sterilising residential lots.
- Maintain green links/shade for walkability.
- Not 100% comfortable with temporary worker accommodation (TWA) close to Murdoch Drive – only supported if short term solution.
- Potential for young professionals/student uses adjacent to Youth Zone. Suggestions canvassed included niche university research centre (shipping/quarantine/mining, engineering), flexible office space rather than campus (also options for virtual campus), exploration of business/research/educational cluster (incubator/shared facilities).



DAY 2

SESSION # 12 REVIEW OF DAY ONE AND OUTCOMES

Presenters: Eber Butron, Russell Dyer, Gordon MacMile

Session Objectives and Processes.

The Town of Port Hedland executive management team openly reflected on stakeholder's comments during Day 1 and discussion of most urgent priorities to complete Growth Plan were identified. These thoughts are outlined below in four categories:

- Housing issues.
- Infrastructure
- Community
- Planning

Stakeholder Response

The session ended with summary of urgent actions identified by stakeholders as:

Housing

- Address lack of availability of housing for accommodation for construction workers/residential as the priority issue.
- Provide commercial land to de-constrain growth of businesses
- Maximise options for water reuse, minimising water consumption through education and identification of alternative water source due to supply limits.

Infrastructure

- Key to success is co-ordination of infrastructure provision by agencies.
- Opportunity to utilise the West Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) and Pilbara Infrastructure Co-ordination Centre (PICC) for co-ordination.
- Maintenance costs and asset management costs need to be factored in to building any new facilities and grant applications.
- Short-term staging plan required for infrastructure with focus on 1-2 year to include airport land as TWA for builders.
- Prioritise rezoning opportunities and use of Pilbara Regional Planning Committee to fast track infrastructure approvals.

Community

- Ensure short term needs don't become long term negative legacy; eg cheaper community facilities and strata title ownership structure for mixed use that deter timely development.

Planning

- Appropriate governance arrangements and execution will be key to implementation success.
- Potential large scale residential project viability needs to be better packaged if to be considered by larger land/building developers new to Hedland.
- Code-assessable permitting was discussed but not considered helpful in the short term as codes need to be prepared.
- Fast-track approvals/processes: there is potential to use a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between government departments (Broome North





model) to provide certainty on timeframes and secure action. Should be used only when proposal area is well defined, all issues are well understood and regulator action is biggest opportunity to reduce the time taken for approvals.

- Growth Plan execution needs to make full use of Pilbara Cities funding of environmental/planning resources placed in approvals agencies to facilitate prioritisation of projects by State agencies.
- Native Title negotiations underway between Pilbara Cities/Port Hedland and Traditional Owners may change precinct plans radically.

Session #13 Implementation Strategy- Growth Model

Presenters: Michael Campbell

Session Objectives and Process

The Pilbara's Port City Growth Model was presented as a tool to inform planning and community facility investment decisions.

Stakeholder Response

Questions and discussion about the model centred on model application, variability of data input, accuracy of model projection/prediction and limitations of the model as a future planning tool.

Stakeholders queried whether the model could be used to develop indicators of sustainable progress and suggested the study consider how the model could be used to develop required indicators/gaps ie future water demand.

“Could this model be used to review how we are going at key points and it would be of benefit to review annual progress”

“It would be good if the model can show the benefits of a sustainable community”

A requirement for the model to provide a more detailed breakdown of local/district/regional community infrastructure needs was considered beneficial for costing purposes and would assist identify requirements for each specific area as opposed to the region as a whole. In addition, the use of the model to predict the need for specific services reflective of population changes was believed to be of benefit for future planning needs. Caution was expressed at providing quality services over quantity and to ensure the needs of a changing community were met.

“Could a breakdown of the model by age be used to reflect projected needs of an ageing community”.

“Can the model factor in other services such as the need for cardiology, mental health, paediatrics in response to changing population needs”

Session #14: Key Priorities and Governance Challenges

Presenters: Filipe Vieira and Kith Clarke

Session Objectives and Process





Consultants presented key components of the management plan and tested stakeholder expectations of the format. The framework was applied to Precinct 2: West End for the purposes of illustrating the staging of land releases, transport networks and phasing of other infrastructure. A proposed governance model was outlined and reaction from the group sought.

Stakeholder response

Urgency

The group stressed the need to achieve early wins. For example, where parcels of land have been identified for early rezoning, these actions should progress even before the draft Growth Plan is complete.

Specifically, it was agreed in principle that development should commence on the land near the Port Hedland waste water treatment plant (despite buffer zone) before relocation of the plant to South Hedland. It was recognised there would be a need to deal with some level of community dissatisfaction for nearby residents however the point was made that long term gains outweigh the short term cost for the community

Presentation of Previous Planning

There was advice that outcomes of previous planning and key assumptions should be clearly articulated in each precinct plan to avoid confusion.

“There is merit in having a short list of proceedings for each precinct to state final decisions, for example no more residences to be built in the West End. If final decisions are listed this makes it clear and leaves room for other discussions”

“When moving (relocating) something you need to state in the same document where it is going so it is clear we are not losing the asset”

The discussion highlighted by the proposed relocation of the pony club identified the tensions that exist between having early plans and having detailed plans much later. Whilst it was accepted that future planning would be required, emphasis was placed on avoiding the outcome of the current planning process to recommend more planning and to ensure concrete actions were decided upon now.

“The plan needs to include things that are concrete and decided upon”

“Going to have to have lead work, investigation, costing, funding, decommissioning etc – fair to say more detail is needed after the plan is published”

Securing Action

The group agreed that responsibilities and actions in Activity Matrix needed to be stated clearly, concise, specific and measureable.

The Memorandum of Understanding technique that worked well for Broome North was discussed as appropriate in the situation where definite parcels of land were identified for redevelopment and for government agencies to respond within timeframes that were reasonable to expect.



Stakeholders expressed a view that environmental planning approvals should be progressed pragmatically rather than individual applications seeking approval for the whole town planning scheme.

Governance Options

The limitations of the redevelopment authority model were presented. The group concluded the model was not appropriate in this context.

The favoured governance model (an adaptation of the Karratha City of the North/Pilbara Cities) framework was presented and reaction was that it was overly complicated. Advice was that the model needed to be reviewed to avoid duplication of existing processes. The current process in place with Pilbara Cities was viewed by the group as working well.

“if what using now is working – why change it”

SESSION # 15 CLOSING COMMENTS

Presenter: Daniel Marsh

Session Objectives and Process

Stakeholders were given a final opportunity to provide the study with advice and to summarise in one or two words the key message they like the study to understand from the two-day workshop.

Stakeholder Response

The following comments were recorded:

“The plan is superb but does not cover short term needs. Nothing happens now, you can plan for this, but it always happens next year”

“The word is urgency – we need to get short term things fixed and say who is going to do that, who is going to deliver that. I understand long term things need to happen in parallel but it all comes back to accommodation”

“We take things as self evident. We understand the nature of the problem and we need to move to solution. ACTION is the word”

“The next 3 – 6 months we need action – don't let this problem become another process and end up in a vacuum. I appreciate what the Town of Port Hedland has done over the past two years and being part of all these discussions”

“It is important to conserve the natural things – the turtle, the creeks, the rivers. It is about sustainability. The community is the key point and if we retain the natural beauty of the area, with green parklands and tress this will keep the community happy. If the community are happy more people will want to come and live here”

“There needs to be a pragmatic environmental assessment of real risks of approving development rather than relying on general guidelines”



“There has been great work already done with extending the water supply and work with the Town of Port Hedland to establish a water wise town. The infrastructure timeline has already been fast tracked in relation to a business as usual time frame. Processes that would normally take 9 years have taken 4 years”

“It is about implementation now – we need contact with the Minister and link major potential funders. We need to consider long term maintenance and sustainability and get the early wins achieved”

“An implementation plan is required and I understand the need for an implementation body to be efficient”

“It is about communication at all levels and it is about commitment. We need a good group of core people and avoid turnover”

**PILBARA'S PORT CITY GROWTH FORUM: WORKSHOP #2****Date: 6th and 7th July 2011****Participants**

NAME:	COMPANY:
Sarah Dougan	Care for Hedland
Mark Irving	Goldstar Consulting
Rob Cornish	Centauri
Mike Clark	GA
Donny Wilson	Pilbara Native Title Services
Patrik Mellberg	BHP Billiton
Peter Buckless	Department of Treasury & Finance
Daphne Gollogly	Port Hedland Port Authority
Paul Trotman	Pilbara Cities
Scott Vincent	RPS - Lead Consultant
Matthew Patullo	RPS - Lead Consultant
Steve Rolls	RPS - Lead Consultant
Denis Ghersinich	Blaxland
John Beck	Blaxland - Director
Liam Thomas	Orica Mining Services - Project Manager
Craig Bramley	Teekay Marine Services - Manager Towage Operations
Kevin Hopkinson	Department of Water - Pilbara Region
Ryan Djanegara	Town of Port Hedland - Planning Officer
Bill Dziombak	Port Hedland Chamber of Commerce
David Hooper	Town of Port Hedland - Councillor
Wanda Kaucz	Department of Planning - Regional Planning and Strategy
Paul Platt	Department of State Development - Project Manager
Geoff Diver	Parsons Brinckerhoff / Diversity - Sustainability Consultant
Mark Lusic	Parsons Brinckerhoff - Sustainability Consultant
Jacinta Harvey	Landcorp - Regional Manager - Pilbara
David Cooper	Landcorp - Project Manager Partnering
Steve Howe	Poags - WA Northern Regional Manager
Morag Lowe	Hedland First National
Vicki James	Fortescue Metals Group Ltd
Paul Martin	Town of Port Hedland - CEO
Leonard Long	Town of Port Hedland - Manager Planning
Luke Cervi	Town of Port Hedland - Senior Planning Officer
Eber Butron	Town of Port Hedland - Director Planning and Development