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Introduction

In September 2014 the Coalition Federal Government (CFG) stated that funding for vital amenities comprising electricity, water, and fundamental facilities in remote Aboriginal communities would cease. The Western Australia (WA) government stated in November 2014 that it would not provide funding and would close 150-282 remote Aboriginal communities in WA (Hunter & Watson, 2015). The Honourable Alanna Clohesy at the 39th parliament first session 2014 of the WA Legislative Council stated:

Their response to their budgetary mismanagement is to make the poor pay, and $90 million is all that will be left in the kitty to support local Aboriginal communities. This government’s view of the big picture is of big business and big money, not of small remote communities (WA Legislative Council, 2014, p.8453).

The current CFG signed a contract with the WA government (WAG) in June 2014 providing the WAG with $90 million to abandon duty for providing necessary services in remote communities (Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Islander Studies, 2014). The WAG views Aboriginal remote communities as not viable because of their size, isolation and lack of employment opportunities (Kimberley Land Council, 2015). The current CFG withdrew the community development project funding from remote communities, ending prospects of employment, and forbid any investment in infrastructure, housing, generators and sanitation (Pilger, 2015).

Previous government assimilation policies forced the removal of Aboriginals from their traditional lands into towns (Amnesty International Australia, [AIA] 2014). Georgatos
(2015) stated that the forced relocation of Aboriginal people from their communities to large towns may be viewed as assimilation. Assimilation was a policy which stated that all Aboriginals will achieve the same means of living as other Australians (Australian Government, 1961). According to Dodson (1996), this policy failed and assimilation led to further destruction of Aboriginal identity and culture. An inability to determine when the assimilation policy ended and whether, in fact, it has ended, leads to the view that the planned closures of remote Aboriginal communities are assimilation. Another view is that the government has an ulterior motive in closing the remote communities and removal of the people. This policy submission will argue that the remote Aboriginal communities must not be closed and funding is available and should be used to keep the remote communities open.

**Background**

There are clear inequalities between Aboriginals and non-Aboriginals throughout all aspects of life (United Nations, [UN], 2013). Aboriginals have a proportional shortcoming in the fulfilment of financial, societal and educational rights, predominantly in employment, accommodation, and education (UN, 2013). A summary of associated concerns conveyed by the UN human rights treaty agency is displayed in Appendix A (UN, 2013). Currently, 17.2 percent of Aboriginal people are unemployed and seven percent of Aboriginal people in northern WA are homeless (Georgatos, 2015; Kimberley Land Council, 2015; Australian Bureau Statistics (ABS), 2013). It is well-substantiated Kerins (2009), stated that living in remote communities on traditional land considerably improves Aboriginals overall health and well-being and reduces homelessness. The suicide rate of Aboriginals has reached catastrophic levels with one suicide per 10,000 Aboriginals compared to one suicide per 45,000 for non-Aboriginals in Australia (Australian Government, 2013). Studies conducted by Colles (2014), confirm that Aboriginals living in remote communities are less likely to
commit suicide and less involved in substance abuse, poor nutrition and disturbing behaviours. This is due to being able to preserve their customary lifestyle away from the pressures of larger towns.

According to Tatz (2005), the interruption of Aboriginal communities resulting from government interference is largely attributable to the high suicide rate. Georgatos (2014), states that the Aboriginal rate of suicide is greatly reduced in remote communities and much higher in regional towns. During the past few years the WAG has closed the remote Aboriginal communities of Lockridge, Coonana and Oombulgurri. Horsely (2013), stated that the Aboriginals evicted from these communities had already been dispossessed from their homeland, Maralinga to allow for atomic testing carried out by the United Kingdom and Australian governments. In 2011 the WAG closed the remote community of Oombulgurri as it considered the community unviable (Martin, 2014). The Oombulgurri community had a population of 107 and the residents were forcibly evicted and relocated to Wyndham, a town with a population of 800 people (AIA, 2014). AIA (2014), reported that Aboriginal residents who wanted to stay were forcibly evicted, without being allowed to take their personal possessions. Bulldozers buried Aboriginals’ homes and personal belongings (see photo in Appendix B to view a bulldozer destroying Aboriginals homes and possessions). This further traumatised the people WAG is obligated to protect, many of the relocated Aboriginals became homeless and many Aboriginals evicted from Coonana and Oombulgurri committed suicide due to the trauma (AIA, 2014). Wyndham residents were also traumatised as it caused a strain on resources in Wyndham.

The fact the CFG ceased funding the Aboriginal remote communities and plans to close them, suggests there may be an ulterior motive. The CFG released a 15 year plan in June
2014 for developing northern Australia to initiate growth by using land now occupied by the remote communities (Northern Australia Taskforce, [NAT], 2014). The Green Paper was released in June 2014, the same time as the CFG stopped funding the remote Aboriginal communities (see map in Appendix C for the area categorised as northern Australia in the green paper). According to NAT (2014), the CFG has allocated a large amount of money to develop northern Australia, where most remote Aboriginal communities are located (see map in Appendix D for the location of most of the remote Aboriginal communities). However, the CFG will not be allocating money to develop the Aboriginal remote communities situated in northern Australia (AIA, 2014). Instead, according to AIA (2014), the CFG together with the WAG, seem determined to remove the Aborigina ls from the remote communities. Mundine (2015), stated that the government does not intend to close white remote communities such as Camballin, Looma and Jarlmadangah. These remote communities are very similar in remoteness, size and infrastructure as the Aboriginal remote communities. The WAGs’ intention not to close these communities implies racism and a breach of human rights. The arrangement by the CFG and the WAG transpired with Aboriginals being left out of the discussion.

As yet, the WAG has declined to speak to lobby groups and lobby groups have stated that the WAG will not meet with them or enter discussions with them about the planned closures (Cromb, 2015). These lobby groups include the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU), Sovereign Union, AIA and the Working Group for Aboriginal Rights (ACTU, 2015; Sovereign Union, 2015; AIA, 2014). The ACTU has condemned the planned closures of the remote Aboriginal communities in WA, stating controversial ‘lifestyle choices’ comments reflect the positions of mining magnates (McQuire, 2015). The Labor federal government stated that Aboriginals have undergone many years of dispossession, dislocation
and detriment. It stated that the CFG and WAG seek to degrade and destroy Aboriginals traditions and culture (Curtin & Norman, 2015). The WAG is acting without notice or consultation, has declined invitations to develop positive solutions and has refused to meet Aboriginal community leaders to talk (KLC, 2015). This shows that the WAG is not concerned with the social, cultural and economic effects that the closures would have. It is suggested that instead of ceasing funding for remote Aboriginal communities, the CFG and WAG should invest in developing the communities in their 15 year plan to develop northern Australia.

**Structural Aspects**

The closure of the remote Aboriginal communities is supported by the CFG, stating that it cannot endlessly subsidise lifestyle choices for Aboriginals to live in a remote areas (Freeman, 2015). McCarthy (2015), reported that the UN special rapporteur stated that using that as a justification to cease federal funding is racist. In an email from Wyatt, WA Shadow Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, he stated:

> To date there has been no policy written on this. This has been my main critique of the government in that they have announced their intention to close communities but have no framework etc. surrounding this decision. Premier Barnett has indicated a few reasons, but these have been found to lack substance. So, we are still waiting on the Barnett Government to release some sort of policy document. (B. S. Wyatt, personal communication, April 13 2015).

As yet, Wyatt states that no framework or policies have been released and Greens senator Rachel Siewert also stated that it is clear that WAG have not got a policy yet (Wahlquist, 2015). However a WA Department of Housing (WADH) draft discussion paper showed development guidelines that had been drawn up (Western Australian Planning Commission, [WAPC], 2013). The WAPC (2013), ranked remote Aboriginal communities using markers
including drinking water, electricity, transport, fresh food, education and health services. The WAPC (2013) in partnership with the WADH categorised Aboriginal remote communities according to an assessment matrix (see data in Appendix E for the WAGs’ assessment matrix). According to Pilger (2015) the WAG stated that those communities at a high risk would cease to receive any government funding (see data in Appendix F for the WADH draft community categories).

**Challenges**

The CFG breached international law by breaking the International Covenant on Economic and Social Rights (ICESR), which the government ratified in 1975 (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade [DFAT], 2009). The CFG under this covenant was responsible for supplying the utilities for running water and power to remote communities. The CFG also breached the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (DRIP), which Australia gave official backing to in 2009 (Australian Human Rights Commission, [AHRC] 2010). The government breached the DRIP Article 19, which asserts that states will ask and communicate with Indigenous peoples to get their free and educated agreement before instigating legislative that might have emotional impact on them (UN, 2013). In addition to breaching the ICESR and the DRIP, the government has also broken the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), Article 1 (UN, 1976). This covenant asserts that every person has the right of autonomy and have the right to liberally control their standing and follow their economic, societal and traditional progress (UN, 1976). According to the UN, the government should respect principles of fairness and responsibility, safeguard equal human rights and not give distinct rights to different racial groups (UN, 2009).
As reported by McQuire (2015), the WAG has shown deceit and a lack of social justice by shifting the reason for closing the communities from a lack of money to protecting the safety of children. On March 05 2015 the WA premier stated that proof will materialise about awful maltreatment of little kids (Kohlbacker, 2015). This is control by divisiveness and Brooks (2014), states this is similar to the fabricated assertions about paedophilia used to validate the repressive Northern Territory intervention. Vague and unsupported allegations should not be used to blemish the standings of Aboriginals in remote communities. The Liberal Party of Australia (2013) states that Aboriginals should be working rather than collecting welfare, it also claims that Aboriginal families and communities are being destroyed by a nanny state. The Liberal Party of Australia (2013), announced that welfare is encouraging dependence by the government funding supporting them. Government values underpinning the problem have failed to provide long term arrangements for economic, housing and education funds (Council of Australian Governments, 2009).

**Strategic Consequences**

Closing remote communities will cause disarray and confusion which will cost the WAG more than addressing present issues. The WA Department of Aboriginal Affairs states that approximately 12,000 Aboriginals live in the 282 communities in WA (WA Department of Aboriginal Affairs, [WADAAB] 2013). The closure of the communities will cause misery to Aboriginals living there, and create complications in the towns they are relocated to. Aboriginals consider a place home because it is an interconnected personal place with past, present and continuing cultural, historical, social and emotional ties that guide everyday life. It shows an absence of empathy by both state and federal governments’ regarding the importance of living on traditional land. Rather than closing communities, it is more economical to distribute sustainable technologies and provide utilities to remote
communities, such as solar panels and pumps to access power and water. The AIA (2015) states that the forced removal of these Aboriginal people will result in social disorder, greater arrest proportions, child removal, family collapse, community misery, and more suicides.

Royalties for Regions (RFR) is a key government-funded program in WA that is managed by the Department of Regional Development (WA Department of Regional Development and Lands, [WADRDL], 2012). Through RFR, 25 percent of WA mining and petroleum royalties is repaid to regional areas as supplementary investment in infrastructure and community services. This money can be used to fund sustainable technologies, schools, education, and community infrastructure and health clinics for the remote communities. The CFG should reinstate funding but, even if it does not, the WAG has substantial funds in the RFR Community Chest Fund that could be used (WADRDL, 2012). An insignificant quantity of the revenue paid by the mining sector could fund the remote Aboriginal communities. A collaborative effort of federal and state government in support of Aboriginals, can be developed through workable changes and the formation of business using the governments’ one billion dollar royalties scheme.

Conclusion

AIA (2014) states that supporting Aboriginals to live in their communities prolongs their life expectancy and advances well-being. It decreases rates of violence, permits contribution to decision making, offers connection to land and culture and diminishes their contact to the detrimental influences in bigger towns (AIA, 2014) It is predominantly to progress these social justice goals, in addition to valuing the substantial relationship Aboriginal people have with their land, that governments should not close the communities. Remote Aboriginal communities’ closures are a straightforward attack on Aboriginals and a profound
intimidation to Aboriginals essential association to traditional land. The governments should be committed to the objective of improving social outcomes for Aboriginals. There is a vast amount of data that demonstrates that association to country and to culture is central to successful well-being outcomes for Aboriginals. Aboriginals in remote communities are more resilient and better-off than people living in towns. If remote communities are closed, then inexcusable rates of suicide and imprisonment will become worse. If the WAG is sincerely concerned by a desire for better-quality social outcomes in remote communities, and is not motivated merely by monetary concerns, then the WAG should take a strengths based approach, not a shortage approach, and spend in promoting cultural resilience and pride.

**Recommendations**

Time, effort, and resources would be better spent if the government used royalties and profits from the mining industry, to invest in the proper development of Aboriginal communities. This would provide efficiency in producing a beneficial outcome effectively allowing the communities to remain open, and would provide education and social justice to benefit Aboriginal people. The WAG should abandon their intentions to close remote Aboriginal communities. They should concentrate on developing a bond with Aboriginals to cultivate and inspire concepts that transform communities into safe places. This can be achieved by providing more funding for social workers to provide more empowering, rights based practice that advances individual and community capability. Social workers respect the innate self-worth of every person and can aim to provide social justice and advocacy in Aboriginal communities. Social justice incorporates the fulfilment of basic needs and the WAG should fund social workers to advance the inadequacies in the Aboriginal communities. The WAG should use RFR money to fund sustainable technologies, schools, education, and community infrastructure and health clinics for Aboriginal remote communities. The WAG should work
to eliminate the obstacles to Aboriginals retaining homes in remote communities. The WAG should create new policy resolutions through appropriate engagement with Aboriginals to include them in decision making that will directly affect them. The WAG must ensure an operative commitment of Aboriginals in the plan of policy frameworks that may advance social and economic backings and develop capabilities.
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Appendix A

The following table provides a summary of associated concerns conveyed by the United Nations human rights treaty agency (United Nations, 2013).

| Environmental health - water, power, sewerage | 2001 survey found 56 communities where water has failed testing, nearly 1000 communities are not connected to state grid electricity, over 1000 communities with septic or other non-town sewerage systems. |
| Life expectancy | Aboriginals live approximately 20 years less than non-Indigenous people. Indigenous males 56.3 years, non-Indigenous 77 years. Indigenous females 62.8 years, non-Indigenous 82.4. |
| Substance abuse | While Aboriginals are less likely to drink alcohol, those who do are far more likely to consume at hazardous levels. The prevalence of smoking is at least twice the rate of non-Indigenous. |
| Juvenile justice | Indigenous juveniles make up 43% of all juveniles in detention, despite comprising less than 4% of the total juvenile population. The level of over-representation of Indigenous juveniles in detention is 20 times the non-Indigenous rate. |
| Child protection | Indigenous children are over-represented in care and protection systems across Australia by 3.2 times the non-Indigenous rate. This over-representation increases with the seriousness of the intervention, with Indigenous children placed under care and protection orders and out-of-home care at 5.9 and 6.3 times the non-Indigenous rates respectively. |
| Income | Average gross household income for Indigenous persons was $364 per week, or 62% of the corresponding income for non-Indigenous persons. |
| Unemployment and welfare | 22% of Indigenous males are unemployed compared to 8% of non-Indigenous males; and 18% of Indigenous females compared to 7% of non-Indigenous females. |
| Education | 32% of Aboriginals did not complete year 10 schooling, compared to 18% of non-Aboriginals. 18% of Aboriginals did complete school to year 12, compared to 41% of non-Aboriginals. |
| Housing | Home ownership rates among Indigenous households are significantly lower than non-Indigenous households (32% compared to 69%). Households with Indigenous persons were more than twice as likely to be living in rental accommodation as non-Indigenous households. |
| Teenagers (aged 15-19 years) at risk of poverty | 44% of all Indigenous teenagers are likely to be at risk of entering into poverty, compared to 15% of non-Indigenous teenagers. This situation worsens further in remote and very remote regions of Australia. |
Appendix B
The following photo shows Oombulgurri community residents being forcibly evicted, while bulldozers buried their homes and belongings (Photography by Tadros, 2015).

Appendix C
For the purposes of the green paper the map shows what is considered as northern Australia for development (Northern Australia Taskforce, 2014).
Appendix D

Location of most of the remote Aboriginal communities (Korff, 2015).
Appendix E

The following is the WA Department of Housing community matrix assessment tool (Western Australian Planning Commission, 2013).

![Aboriginal Settlements Guideline 2: Provision of Housing and Infrastructure](image)

### Table 1: Housing and Infrastructure Assessment Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Low risk (10)</th>
<th>Medium risk (5)</th>
<th>High risk (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>Drinking water services managed by a regulated service provider. AND</td>
<td>Drinking water services operated by community organisation with repair, maintenance and capital works support and water quality monitoring provided by government contracted service provider. AND.</td>
<td>Drinking water services are managed by community organisation. OR Water quantity not sufficient for current demand. OR Water quality and/or quantity unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Regulated electricity supply with reliable generation, distribution and</td>
<td>Electricity supply and distribution network operated by community organisation with repair, maintenance and capital works support and water quality monitoring provided by government contracted service provider. AND.</td>
<td>Electricity supply and distribution network community organisation operated and managed. OR Limited access to technical support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>Settlement area located on land whereon flood is not expected to risk safety or infrastructure.</td>
<td>Settlement area located on land whereon flood is expected to risk safety or infrastructure.</td>
<td>Settlement area located on land whereon flood is known to be experienced and no mitigation measures are in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land tenure</td>
<td>Settlement area completely located on land with secure and appropriate land tenure.</td>
<td>Settlement area partially located on land with secure and appropriate land tenure.</td>
<td>Settlement area located on land without secure and appropriate land tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Wastewater services comply with relevant government sewerage policy and the case of reticulated sewage, wastewater services are managed by a regulated service provider.</td>
<td>Wastewater services comply with relevant government sewerage policy AND.</td>
<td>Wastewater services do not comply with relevant government sewerage policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place And Planning</td>
<td>Low risk (10)</td>
<td>Medium risk (5)</td>
<td>High risk (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency assistance</td>
<td>Emergency services on more than 30 minutes total travel time. AND</td>
<td>Emergency services more than 2 hours total travel time. OR Unreliable telecommunication services.</td>
<td>Emergency services more than 2 hours total travel time. OR Unreliable telecommunication services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>School less than 180 minutes travel time OR Alternative school service (such as distance education) available.</td>
<td>School greater than 30 minutes but less than 1 hour travel time OR Unreliable telecommunication services.</td>
<td>School more than 1 hour travel time OR Unreliable telecommunication services OR No alternative school service such as distance education available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Part-time clinic within 30 minutes travel time OR Full-time clinic greater than 30 minutes travel time OR Unreliable telecommunication services.</td>
<td>Part-time clinic within 30 minutes travel time OR Full-time clinic greater than 30 minutes travel time OR Unreliable telecommunication services.</td>
<td>Clinic (full-time or part-time) more than 1 hour travel time OR Unreliable telecommunication services OR Regular professional outreach service not available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 continues next page.
## Table 1: Housing and Infrastructure Assessment Matrix (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place And Planning</th>
<th>Low risk (5)</th>
<th>Medium risk (2.5)</th>
<th>High risk (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Food</td>
<td>Shop no more than 30 minutes reliable road access. AND/OR Year-round alternative food sources proximate to Aboriginal settlement.</td>
<td>Shop greater than 30 minutes but no more than 1 hour reliable road access. AND/OR Seasonal alternative food sources proximate to Aboriginal settlement.</td>
<td>Shop more than 1 hour reliable road access. AND/OR Alternative food sources not proximate to Aboriginal settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Transport</td>
<td>Reliable road access to regional centre. OR District airstrip no more than 30 minutes reliable road access. OR Reliable barge service.</td>
<td>Road access to regional centre known to become seasonally cut-off for periods of no more than 2 consecutive weeks. OR District airstrip greater than 30 minutes but no more than 2 hours reliable road access.</td>
<td>Road access to regional centre known to become seasonally cut-off for periods of more than 2 consecutive weeks. OR District airstrip more than 2 hours reliable road access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Waste Services</td>
<td>Waste is disposed of in a regulated rubbish tip. AND There is a regular and reliable rubbish service.</td>
<td>Waste is disposed of in an unregulated rubbish tip that is in a location that complies with relevant government policy. AND There is a regular and reliable rubbish service.</td>
<td>Waste is disposed of in an unregulated rubbish tip that is in a location that does not comply with relevant government policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Employment and enterprise</td>
<td>No more than 1 hour total travel time from an established job market. OR Community organisation or individuals and families have existing enterprises.</td>
<td>Greater than 1 hour but no more than 2 hours total travel time from an established job market. OR Community organisation or individuals and families have potential enterprises.</td>
<td>More than 2 hours total travel time from an established job market. OR Community organisation or individuals and families have no existing or potential enterprises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Governance</td>
<td>Community organisation incorporated under appropriate legislation. AND Community organisation meeting regulatory requirements and has sufficient administrative support.</td>
<td>Community organisation has recent or current management and/or governance difficulties. OR Community organisation is under administration and/or other external management intervention.</td>
<td>Community organisation does not meet regulatory requirements. OR Community organisation has inadequate administrative support. OR Government agencies and service providers are unable to engage effectively with the community organisation to plan and implement service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Aboriginal heritage</td>
<td>A heritage survey(s) has been completed for the full extent of the settlement area and incorporated into the Layout Plan.</td>
<td>A heritage survey(s) has been completed for the full extent of the settlement area.</td>
<td>A heritage survey has not been completed for the full extent of the settlement area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Planning</td>
<td>A Layout Plan has been prepared and endorsed under SPP3.2.</td>
<td>A Layout Plan has been prepared under SPP3.2, but has not been endorsed.</td>
<td>A Layout Plan has not been prepared under SPP3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals | 100 | 50 | 0 |
### Aboriginal Settlements Guideline 2:
Provision of Housing and Infrastructure

#### Table 2: Housing and Infrastructure Assessment Ratings Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Characterisation</th>
<th>Prioritisation and Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 to 75.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and infrastructure development has a high probability of:</td>
<td>High priority target for government funded housing and infrastructure development. Coordinate housing and infrastructure investment to maximise efficiencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• contributing to the provision of a high standard of living for residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximising returns on government investment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 75 to 50.1 |
| Developing |
| Housing and infrastructure development has a high to medium probability of: | High to medium priority target for government funded housing and infrastructure development. Coordinate housing and infrastructure investment to maximise efficiencies. |
| • contributing to the provision of a high standard of living for residents. | Prioritise resolving low rated indicators prior to or as part of any significant housing investment. |
| • Maximising returns on government investment. | |

| 50 to 25.1 |
| Under-developed |
| Housing and infrastructure development has a medium to low probability of: | Medium to low priority target for government funded housing and infrastructure development. |
| • contributing to the provision of a high standard of living for residents. | Limit investment to essential services infrastructure investment that is critical to maintenance of existing provision. |
| • Maximising returns on government investment. | Housing and infrastructure investment should not proceed until government and community organisation have an agreed approach to increase the probability of that investment: |
| \*Agreed approach options include development prioritisation, alternative accommodation options and innovative service arrangements. \* | • contributing to the provision of a high standard of living for residents. |
| \*NOTE: Low ratings may also be a result of unknown or unreliable data. If this is the case, data collection and analysis should be prioritised. \* | • Maximising returns on government investment. |
Appendix F

The following is the WA Department of Housing draft discussion paper showing proposed community categories (Perpitch, 2015).

PROPOSED COMMUNITY CATEGORIES

The ABC has seen two draft internal WA Government documents which indicate five separate funding categories, and communities which may be included in each.

The collated information is listed below.

Category 1:

Description: remote settlements with a normal population of 200 people or more and at least 40 dwellings and assessed under Guideline 2 as a low risk for future investment.

Proposed level of investment: major focus of State Government investment. Likely major community service centre with on site education, health and potential police facilities. Regulated utility services. Consideration for future gazettel as town sites.

Estimated number of communities: 16.

Believed to include:
Bidyadanga, Broome region, 332 people, matrix rating 82.5
Balgo, Halls Creek region, 593 people, matrix rating 82.5
Looma, West Kimberley region, 373 people, matrix rating 90
Bayulu, West Kimberley region, 321 people, matrix rating 80

Category 2:

Description: remote settlements with a normal population of 100-200 people and 20-40 dwellings. And assessed under Guideline 2 as a low risk for future investment.

Proposed investment level: moderate to significant government investment. Service levels may vary from category 1.

Estimated number of communities: 18

Believed to include:
Tjuntjuntjara, Goldfields region, 204 people, matrix rating 52.5
Wararm, NG region, 149 people, matrix rating 80
Mulan, Halls Creek region, 148 people, matrix rating 62.5
Parrngurr (Cotton Creek), Pilbara, 126 people, matrix rating 60

Category 3.

Description: Remote settlements with a normal population of 30-100 people and 5-20 dwellings and/or communities assessed under Guideline 2 as medium to low risk for future investment.

Proposed level of investment: Limited to moderate government investment depending on the nature of risks and available risk mitigation measures. Service levels may vary from categories 1 and 2.

Estimated number of communities: 89

Believed to include:
Mt Margaret, Goldfields region, 92 people, matrix rating 67.5
Karalundi, Mid West region, 72 people, matrix rating 75
Koorabye, West Kimberley, 54 people, matrix rating 55
Dodnun, East Kimberley, 43 people, matrix rating 47.5

Category 4:

Description: remote communities with a permanent population of less than 30 or less than 5 dwellings. And/or Communities assessed as high risk with some economic risk mitigation measures available.

Proposed level of investment: Very limited government investment with focus on asset maintenance and training for self reliance. Otherwise private investment is required.

Estimated number of communities: 53

Believed to include:
Billard, Broome region, 72 people, matrix rating 45
Alligator Hole, East Kimberley region, 33 people, matrix rating 30
Monbon, Broome region, 28 people, matrix rating 35
Morapoi, Mid West region, 20 people, matrix rating 47.5

Category 5:

Description: Non permanently occupied communities and or under-developed communities assessed as high risk and no economic mitigation measures available.

Proposed level of investment: No further government investment. Private investment only.

Estimated number of communities: 75

Listed as potentially category to include:
Goodalargin (A), Broome region, 37 people, matrix rating 15
Yallet (Ngartan Burr), Broome region, 31 people, matrix rating 15
Biridu, West Kimberley, 30 people, matrix rating 20
Jundaru, Pilbara region, 4 people, matrix rating 20
Robe River Junction, Halls Creek, 4 people, matrix rating 17.5