



CORE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON WASTE (3C) RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS MADE ON THE EXHIBITED SHORT LISTED SITE – MT MARSHALL (NEAR BENCUBBIN)

The Core Consultative Committee would like to thank all individuals/groups who provided comments on the Exhibited sites. This document summarises all submissions received that are specific to the Mt Marshall (near Bencubbin) site and contains the 3C's responses to these. Any comments in submissions that are generic to all sites (i.e., are not site specific), have been summarised in a separate document titled "Response to Submissions on Non-Site-Specific Issues".

In order to analyse and respond to comments, submissions have been summarised and presented in tabular format with 3C responses to the issues raised also provided. To protect the privacy of submission writers, a unique code has been allocated to each submission. A letter will be sent to advise you of your code when the final summary of submissions document is released after the Cabinet decision has been made. Any submissions made by public authorities (e.g. Local and State Government Agencies) or broad stakeholder interest groups (e.g. the eight Representative Community Groups, clubs, churches, chambers etc) are publicly identifiable and are listed in the final table appended to the end of this report.

Table 1 contains comments relating specifically to the site selection criteria. The remaining tables relate to non-criteria specific factors.

These documents have been provided to State Cabinet in support of our advice on preferred sites.

Table 1: Mt Marshall - Summary of Submissions against the Site Selection Criteria

No.	Specific Factor	Criteria	Submissions	Responses
1	Flood plains	At least 500mm above a 100 year ARI floodplain.		
2	<i>Natural Waterways/Wetlands/Marine Systems</i>	<i>Not less than 1000m from high conservation/ecological value aquatic ecosystems, not less than 500m from a slightly too moderately disturbed systems and not less than 250m from highly disturbed aquatic systems.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The only concern with site is its proximity (1.1 km) to a salt lake system. An assessment to determine the risk to this wetland system through surface and groundwater movements would be required. (DCLM) 2. Consideration should be given, however to the potential for off-site impacts on the salt lake system in close proximity. (DCLM) 3. It is recommended a comprehensive study involving the identification, delineation and evaluation of wetlands in the AIP, Shire of Mt Marshall and Site MSW039 is conducted before the final site is selected. (DoE) 4. Aerial photography and hydrographic mapping indicate a paleochannel system of salt lakes is less than 1km to the north west of the proposed site and a minor non-perennial watercourse is approximately 250m to the southeast. (DoE) 5. Evaporation pond overflow may contaminate nearby salt lake. (MM20) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proximity of Lake McDermott to the site is noted. The criterion is deemed to be met as the salt lake system is 1.1km from the site. 2. Noted, however the stringent technology suitability criteria should eliminate or minimise impacts on the surrounding environment. 3. Noted, once a general site has been selected, more detailed studies will need to be undertaken to identify the best location within the exhibited site for a precinct. 4. The 3C has advice from CALM that indicates the salt lake system is 1.1km from the site and therefore outside the area considered by this criterion. The 3C acknowledge non permanent watercourses occur in the area but the majority of the site meets this criterion. 5. The combined site selection criteria and technology suitability criteria are some of the most stringent criteria for any type of industrial facility. When implemented together, these criteria should ensure the risks of impacts to waterways can be managed. <p><u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.</p>
3	Groundwater	Not within Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSAs) P1-P3 priority areas identified in published development plans.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is not within a PDWSA. (SoMM) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreed. <p><u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.</p>
4	Groundwater	Groundwater should be maintained at least 5m below the surface.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Saline ground water may be encountered at less than 5m. (DA) 2. The area is not impacted by high water tables. (SoMM) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Once a general site has been selected the 3C understands that more detailed studies will be undertaken to identify the best location within the exhibited site for a precinct. It is at that stage that

No.	Specific Factor	Criteria	Submissions	Responses
			3. Water table may be higher due to its proximity to the nearby salt lake. (MM20)	<p>detailed studies would be undertaken. The 3C believes that it has sufficient information to indicate that there is enough land within the site that can meet this criterion.</p> <p>2. Agreed.</p> <p>3. Refer to response 1, above.</p> <p><u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.</p>
5	Groundwater	Hydraulic conductivity of any soil (natural or engineered) above ground water shall ensure that the transport time of contaminants to groundwater is more than 2 years.	<p>1. Hydraulic conductivities encountered on the site are likely to be variable and may require investigation. (DA)</p> <p>2. Possible evaporation pond overflow may contaminate nearby salt lake system. (MM20)</p>	<p>1. Whilst the soils of the site may have a high hydraulic conductivity, this criterion allows for engineered approaches to be used to ensure that the transport time of contaminants to ground water is more than 2 years. The 3C is confident that this criterion can be met.</p> <p>2. The combined site selection criteria and technology suitability criteria are some of the most stringent criteria for any type of industrial facility. When implemented together, these criteria should ensure the risks of impacts to waterways can be managed.</p> <p><u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.</p>
6	Constructed drainage systems e.g. stormwater or road drainage	Not within 100m of an entry point of a constructed drain.		
7	Hydrogeology	Should be located in an area where the hydrogeology can be readily monitored and managed with confidence.		
8	Geological Stability	Located on stable ground; i.e., not in a seismically active area, areas susceptible to soil sinking, landslides or swelling, karst or sinkhole terrain.		

No.	Specific Factor	Criteria	Submissions	Responses
9	Acid Sulfate Soils	Not located on soils with high acid sulfate generating potential.		
10	Topography	Not located in an area with a slope >4 %.	1. The site is flat. (NTN, CSA)	1. Agreed. <u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.
11	<i>Threatened Flora, Fauna and Ecological Communities</i>	<i>Not within 500m of known habitats of threatened species of flora or fauna or threatened ecological communities except where the maintenance of threatened species or threatened ecological community values can be clearly demonstrated.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> There are no known habitats of threatened species of flora or fauna or threatened ecological communities within 500m of the site. (DCLM) The site does not contain any DRF, threatened fauna or threatened ecological communities. (DCLM) May be unique flora/fauna that was discovered in the Bio Blitz conducted in Lake McDermott a few years ago. (MM20) The site is not within 500m of known habitats of threatened species of flora and fauna or threatened ecological communities. (SoMM) The site is devoid of native vegetation. (NTN, CSA) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted Noted The 3C has been provided with a copy of a report on a Bio Blitz conducted at Lake McDermott by the World Wildlife fund in 2002. It states no rare flora or fauna was present in the area. Advice from CALM confirms this. Agreed. Agreed. <u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.
12	Conservation Value	No negative impact on national parks, nature reserves, or areas under conservation covenants.	1. Site is not likely to impact on any CALM-managed estate or conservation covenant sites. (DCLM)	1. Noted. <u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.
13	“Bush Forever” sites	Not within areas designated or proposed as ‘Bush Forever’ sites.		
14	<i>Public Acceptability</i>	<i>A minimum 3km buffer from the nearest sensitive land use, with a desirable buffer distance of 6km from the nearest sensitive land use.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The site is not near any sensitive land use and will not be at risk from approaching or future urban development. (SoMM) There are no households at all within the essential 3km buffer distance of the proposed site. Indeed, we understand that if a treatment precinct were placed on the northern boundary of the site (near the railway line and the Koorda – Bullfinch Road) the nearest residential neighbour would be almost 5km away. (NTN, CSA) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed. Noted. <u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.

No.	Specific Factor	Criteria	Submissions	Responses
15	Heritage Value	No negative impact on sites of recognised cultural or historical significance.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No Aboriginal sites have been recorded on this location or anywhere nearby. A search on the DIA register returned no recorded sites in the area. (Ind) The physiography of the location is such that it is unlikely Aboriginal sites will be found and its selection for the treatment plants location is supported by the native title claimants. (Ind) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Noted. <p><u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.</p>
16	Transport Routes	Must be within 25km of major transport routes or suitable railway lines.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The site is in very close proximity to a major transport route and railway line. (SoMM) Rail transportation to the site is a low risk transportation option and the community's preference, as it segregates transport of hazardous waste from other vehicles on the roads. (MMRCG) Road transport to the site is perceived to be a higher risk option, due to the need for multiple vehicle movements and sharing the road with other commuters. There is a strong community preference to avoid use of the Toodyay Rd for transport of hazardous waste, due to the limited seal width and a perception that the road is dangerous. (MMRCG) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed. Noted. However given the relatively small volume of hazardous/industrial waste currently generated in WA and that it will be sent to the precinct from many different sources it is likely that the use of rail transport will not be viable. Noted. <p><u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.</p>
17	Transport Routes	Any traffic on local roads must be within acceptable congestion and safety limits.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This site is considered unviable due to inadequate standard of the transport route involving Goomalling-Merredin Rd and Local Government roads. (MR) The precinct would bring extra heavy traffic on our roads. (MM443) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. It is estimated that if all of the hazardous wastes currently treated in the State were directed to a precinct, that there would be between 10 and 20 truck movement per day. The movement of controlled wastes on the road are regulated under the Environmental Protection (Controlled Waste) Regulations. The transport of dangerous goods is done in accordance with the existing suite of procedures flowing from the Australian Code for the Transport of Dangerous Goods by Road and Rail, associated dangerous goods regulations and emergency response procedures would apply. <p><u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.</p>

No.	Specific Factor	Criteria	Submissions	Responses
18	Emergency Services	Within approximately 25 minutes of adequate off-site emergency services including medical and fire fighting facilities.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FESA is unable to support any of the exhibited sites in the south-west because of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased risks to the community associated with the transport distances • the expectations placed on local volunteers where no permanent career services are located (except Kemerton). • the expectations placed on volunteers placed along transport routes. • The additional cost burden that may be placed on FESA in the Provision of emergency services in isolated regions; and • in finding local community members to volunteer for hazardous materials response. (FESA) 2. Mt Marshall district is serviced by volunteer bush fire brigade and volunteer ambulance drivers. Kununoppin Hospital is 32km from the proposed site and Merredin Hospital is 88km from the site. (SoMM, MMRCG) 3. The property where the site is located has an airstrip that could be upgraded to Royal Flying Doctor Service standards. (SoMM) 4. As local volunteers cannot attend toxic fires a bunker could be built that contains specialist equipment for HAZMAT fires. In the event of an emergency, specialized fire fighters can be at the site in 45 minutes air time. The local volunteers could have the specialized equipment ready and mobilized. (SoMM) 5. The companies operating the waste precinct should have their own staff trained in specialist fire fighting and have designated emergency response officers. (SoMM) 6. The local silver chain can be updated to contain a ready emergency response centre. There is land adjoining the current Silver Chain post to allow this to occur. (SoMM) 	1-11 It is acknowledged that the site is not within 25 minutes of existing adequate offsite emergency services. This was set as a desirable criterion rather than an essential criterion in acknowledgement that on-site emergency services could be provided if required. The need for this can be better ascertained during formal assessment processes once specific treatment proposals have been put forward.

No.	Specific Factor	Criteria	Submissions	Responses
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. All site personnel should be required to undertake mandatory training in safe operation of the site and regular training exercises for emergency response should be undertaken. (MMRCG) 8. The nearest Fire & Rescue Service (FRS) is in Wyalcatchem, 40km away. The FRS is trained in use of Breathing Apparatus and in HAZMAT, and is estimated it would be able to respond in 45minutes. (MMRCG) 9. Advice from FESA is that to coordinate a response from Perth would be likely to take 90 minutes or more. (MMRCG) 10. Local response teams (Bencubbin BFS & Wyalcatchem FRS) should be familiarized with hazards and appropriate responses for the site. (MMRCG) 11. Local medical facilities are likely to be able to manage small emergencies but are likely to struggle in a situation where more than one critical patient needs stabilization. (MMRCG) 	<p><u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site does not meet this criterion.</p>
19	Proximity to waste generating areas	Within 150km from where 80% of the waste it treats is generated.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A reference to the road map indicates total travel distance from Perth of 273kms to the proposed Mt Marshall site. (FESA) 2. The Bencubbin site is 273km from Perth CBD. The Shire of Mt Marshall understands that currently industrial waste is transported to both South Australia and Kalgoorlie for processing. A site near Bencubbin would reduce the travel time and distance for processing. (SoMM) 3. The site is almost 300km by road from Perth. We have heard comments to the effect that some sections of industry will not countenance establishing a precinct that distance from Perth. Most metropolitan-based industries using offsite hazardous waste treatment currently have to countenance their waste being transported more than twice this distance to Kalgoorlie or even far further a field to Port Hedland or the Eastern 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted, however this criterion is desirable and not essential to the sites suitability. 2. Noted. 3. Noted. 4. Noted.

No.	Specific Factor	Criteria	Submissions	Responses
			States. We do not see merit in arguing the Mount Marshall site is too remote. (NTN, CSA) 4. ACE note that the distance of approx 250km from Perth may lead to industry objections about the price of transport etc but would suggest that the current treatment of most wastes in Kalgoorlie is twice the distance and no doubt more expensive. (ACE, CSA)	<u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site does not meet this criterion.
20	Land Ownership	Located on State Government owned land.		
21	Legislative Jurisdiction	Within the jurisdiction of Western Australian legislation, policies or regulations; i.e., not on Commonwealth land.		
22	Equity/ employment	Within a reasonable commuting distance of a centre providing adequate facilities for a skilled workforce and their families.	1. At the time of writing this submission the Shire of Mt Marshall has become aware of the expansion of the Mukinbudin High School to year 12. A daily bus currently takes school children to Mukinbudin High School. (SoMM, BEDA)	1. Mukinbudin District High School will offer Year 11 & 12 in 2007. However the site at present is outside the 50+km distance considered a reasonable commuting distance from regional centres. <u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site is considered to meet this criterion.
23	Services	Ability to provide adequate access to water, telephone and electricity.	1. Has a reasonable potable supply of water (100mm main) in the vicinity of the site. (WC) 2. Power supply in area can be unreliable. At the moment is probably inadequate for needs of the precinct. Feel that existing residents/businesses power supply should be protected if a precinct is established. (MM20)	1. Noted. 2. Noted. The 3C maintains that water, power and telephone services can be made available to the site, however not all services are currently connected. <u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site meets this criterion.
24	Climate/ landform	Not in an area prone to frequent temperature inversions.	1. Local conditions of having a lot of inversions, is not compatible with burning waste. (MM446)	1. The 3C acknowledges that the site is susceptible to temperature inversions and this criterion has not been met. However the Cabinet endorsed Technological Suitability Criteria ban the use of incineration within precincts <u>3C Conclusion:</u> The site does not meet this criterion.

NON SITING CRITERIA MATTERS – MT MARSHALL (NEAR BENCUBBIN)

Table 2: Mt Marshall (Near Bencubbin) - Socio-Economic Issues

Issue	Raised By
Town may not accommodate the workforce during construction and operation. Housing has been at a premium in Bencubbin recently and there may be difficulties finding places for people to live.	MM20
Shire's population is low should there be an incident – risk is lower than if incident happens in a high population area.	MM20
The increase in the population would benefit the town and shire.	MM20
ACE supports the establishment of a precinct at the Mt Marshall site.	ACE
Has quick access to an airstrip and transfer time to Royal Perth Hospital's trauma and burns units.	Kem33
The proposed HWTP is what the Bencubbin community requires to give it an economic, industrial and social boost and ensure the community's long term survival.	LMCG, BEDA
The proposed site will have a great benefit to the Bencubbin district through potential increased population and flow-on. We have been told that the precinct will bring 15 to 20 employees and this will result in additional children for the school, extra small to medium sized businesses, potential industrial enterprises and increased participation in sporting clubs.	BEDA, MM447
Great opportunity for the community in terms of bringing new families to town and creating jobs as well as flow on to existing business. Well done Shire of Mt Marshall, great initiative.	MM452, MM453, MM454, MM458, MMRCG
It needs to bring people and money into Bencubbin, not much point having it if they're all going to live in Mukinbudin or another surrounding town.	MM453, MM458
Support it as long as the right provisions are in place for human safety.	MM456
Where infrastructure upgrades will be required for the site, if possible the upgrades should be extended so as to provide a useful benefit for the local community.	MMRCG
The increased employment in the precinct does not outweigh the unknown impacts of the precinct.	MM446
3C Response:	
The 3C notes the issues raised by these submitters.	

Table 3: Mt Marshall (Near Bencubbin)- Environmental Issues

Issue	Raised By
Site has the advantage of being cleared freehold land that does not contain any DRF, threatened fauna or threatened ecological communities and consequently there is minimal potential to impact biodiversity values.	DCLM
Concerned about flooding of noxious toxins into nearby agricultural land and the precinct would increase pressure on our water supplies.	MM443
Provided the HWTP doesn't have hazardous or toxic emissions into soil, water or air, it would be a good alternative industry to have in the district, and would be an alternative source of jobs as primary industry becomes more marginalized.	MM461, MM458
My main concerns are the exact degree of hazard, and its effect on crops, fodder, soil, the potential for airborne pollution to be carried by prevailing south easterlies, risks involved in transporting, the health risks for workers at the facility and the lifetime of the facility? In my opinion any employment created would be outweighed by the unknown nature of the exact hazards involved.	MM457
The presence of the nature reserve across the road from the sites was the only possible drawback people identified for this site.	Ind

Issue	Raised By
3C Response: The combined site selection criteria and technology suitability criteria are some of the most stringent criteria for any type of industrial facility. When implemented together, these criteria should ensure the risks of impacts to waterways can be managed.	

Table 4: Mt Marshall (Near Bencubbin) - Buffer Zone

Issue	Raised By
Our family has a part of our farm on the southern boundary of the proposed Bencubbin Waste Treatment Plant. We are not in favour of the proposed site as we believe it will have an impact on our business.	MM80
3C Response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. It is agreed that all farms have the right to maintain viability. A precinct represents no real threat to the viability of any farms in the region. 	

Table 5: Mt Marshall (Near Bencubbin) - Site Monitoring Committees

Issue	Raised By
The existing Bencubbin Waste Treatment Precinct Reference Group should be maintained as a community reference group to liaise with the site during planning, design, construction and operations.	MMRCG
If road transportation is to be utilized, consultation should begin with the shires of Kellerberrin and Trayning to manage community concerns regarding waste being transported through them.	MMRCG
3C Response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The 3C supports these comments. 	

Table 6: Mt Marshall (Near Bencubbin) - 3C Conduct and Process

Issue	Raised By
The Bencubbin Community would like to congratulate the 3C for its efforts in engaging the Bencubbin community and being available to address Community concerns.	BEDA
It's a wonderful opportunity for the community.	MM448, MM455
Shire of Mt Marshall site is considered to meet the site selection criteria.	DoE
Preferred site for HWTP in the south west is the Shire of Mt Marshall site.	DCLM
3C Response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 3C notes the comments on the conduct of the process. 	

Table 7: Mt Marshall (Near Bencubbin) -Transport

Issue	Raised By
If road transportation is to be utilized a turning lane on the Koorda-Bullfinch Rd should be installed to ensure a safe entrance point.	MMRCG
Both the Mt Marshall and Bruce Rock sites require access via smaller trunk roads. All these roads should be surveyed and reported for additional risks before any final decision is made with respect to site selection. Some additional risks could include narrow bridges, flood ways, level crossings, all weather capability, as well as additional traffic that may be associated with mine sites and seasonal grain haulage.	FESA
3C Response:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Main Roads would be consulted and involved in an assessment of preferred transport routes if this site were recommended as a location for a HWTP. 	

Table 8: Mt Marshall (Near Bencubbin) -Technology

Issue	Raised By
Concern that future changes will allow the precinct to become a radioactive and highly toxic waste dump or host an incinerator.	MM462, MM445, MM453
3C Response:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Technological Suitability Criteria ban incineration or landfilling of waste within a precinct. All radioactive waste generated in WA is regulated by the Department of Health and is generally disposed of at the Mt Walton Class 5 Landfill, this will continue. 	

Table 9: Mt Marshall (Near Bencubbin) - Miscellaneous

Issue	Raised By
Support precinct at the short listed site in their local area.	MM20, MM451, MM450, MM449, BEDA, SoMM, MMRCG
We recommend that the Mount Marshall site be selected as the preferred site.	NTN
The Mount Marshall site is the only site in the south west that appears to have progressed through the public exhibition process without the identification of additional constraints to its use for a HWTP.	NTN
If a precinct was established in Mt Marshall a program of testing local produce (meat/wool/grain etc) for quality assurance would need to be established – what would be the costs of such a program?	MM20, MMRCG
In favour as long as it is what they say it is. No dangerous toxic waste, no incinerators and it safe to the environment and farming land.	MM453
Meets almost every essential criterion.	Kem33
The best place to locate a precinct is close to the Koorda – Bullfinch Road and railway line.	MM20, NTN
If unfortunately our concerns are ignored and the site is built, then place it in the north west corner of the block near McKenzie Rd and the Koorda – Southern Cross Rd so it as far away as possible from our land.	MM80
I wish to voice my concern and disapproval regarding the HWTP, why bring a noxious industry to a clean food and wheat producing district. Also once the facility is established, whether good or bad, it is not likely to be closed.	MM443
In the south west there was virtually unanimous agreement that the Mt Marshall sites was the best location for the plant, judged on all criteria.	Ind
3C Response:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 3C notes the comments both for and against a precinct at the Bencubbin site. The 3C is not able to comment on the costs of any baseline testing program for meat/wool/grain etc. 	

Key to Summary of Submissions Tables

Code	Received from
ACE	Alliance for a Clean Environment
ALP-Asb	Australian Labor Party Australind Sub-Branch
ALPSH	Australian Labour Party, South Hedland Sub Branch
BCC	Binningup Church of Christ
BCA	Binningup Community Association
BEDA	Bencubbin Economic Development Association
BGPA	Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority
BRLC	Bruce Rock Land Conservation District Committee
BRRCG	Bruce Rock Representative Community Group
CCI	Chamber of Commerce and Industry
CfH	Care for Hedland Environmental Association Inc.
CoB	City of Bunbury
CSA	Contaminated Sites Alliance: Mirrabooka Action Group
DA	Department of Agriculture
DCEP	Department of Consumer and Employment Protection
DCLM	Department of Conservation and Land Management
DoE	Department of Environment
DoEH	Department of Environment and Heritage
DoH	Department of Health
DOIR	Department of Industry and Resources
DPC	Department of the Premier and Cabinet
DPI	Department for Planning and Infrastructure
DSL	Dampier Salt Ltd
FESA	Fire and Emergency Services Authority
Kem338	Facilitation Group of the Kemerton Community Committee

Code	Received from
HC	Heritage Council
Ind	Indigenous Community Liaison as provided via Nyaarla Projects Pty Ltd in their report Aboriginal Community Liaison (May 2006)
KCCFG	KCC Facilitation Group (majority response)
KIPCC	Kemerton Industrial Park Coordinating Committee
KNS	Kalgoorlie Nickel Smelter & Concentrator – Nickel West
KRCG	Kalgoorlie Representative Community Group
LC	LandCorp
LCC	Leschenault Catchment Council
Kem200	Leeuwin Environment
LMCG	Lake McDermott Catchment Group
LPA	The Leschenault Progress Association
MMRCG	Bencubbin Waste Treatment Precinct Reference Group
MR	Main Roads
NTN	National Toxics Network Inc
OIC	Office of the Information Commissioner
PAN	Pollution Action Network
PDC	Pilbara Development Commission
PG	Pilbara Greens Local Group
PHCCI	Port Hedland Chamber of Commerce and Industry Inc
Kem329	Riverlinks Child Care and Community Centre
SBDC	Small Business Development Corporation
SIPH	Soroptimist International Port Hedland
Kem345	Shire of Capel
SoC	Shire of Coolgardie
SoDard	Shire of Dardanup
SoH	Shire of Harvey Council
SoMM	Shire of Mt Marshall

Code	Received from
SoN	Shire of Northam
SoR	Shire of Roebourne
STAR	STAR Alliance
Kem342	South West Environment Centre Inc.
TKAN	The Kemerton Action Network
ToN	Town of Northam
ToNS	Town of Northam Supplementary Submission
TPH	Town of Port Hedland
WAI	Wedgfield Association Inc
WC	Water Corporation
Kem40	Wildflower Society of WA Inc.
A17	Wheatbelt Development Commission
WCS	Wetlands Conservation Society