

WATER CORPORATION – FORUM 10

MUNDARING WATER TREATMENT PLANT CONSULTATION

	<p>Well thank you for attending this Forum. I had a couple of apologies which I will just note, Jenny Mills, Rose Rudeforth, Peter Van Gelogen, Ken Walter, Megan Dilling from GHD and John Henstridge from Data Analysis Australia.</p> <p>Are there any other apologies that people are aware of?</p> <p>Bev Schultz from Forest Alliance Conservation Council, any others, and Jo Radicic. OK, thank you very much for coming out again.</p> <p>Just very quickly I will just explain the intent for this evening. If you could just – on the Powerpoint – essentially we are aiming to do four things tonight. On your chairs is some additional information that has been generated from questions raised at the last Forum. I will explain that issue in a bit more detail in a minute. So, that has been provided plus you may want some clarifications on that information. So, we will give you a time to have a quick look through that and then seek any clarifications.</p> <p>The other thing we want to do tonight is to discuss any of the site related issues that people would like to discuss to enable decisions to complete a rating. So, they maybe issues, people have raised with me some issues that are generic, in other words they go across a number of sites, that they would like to discuss, and some specific to individual sites that they would like to discuss.</p> <p>So, what I hope to do is identify some of those issues, see if there are particular people who want to comment about those and then we will provide opportunities to work through those issues.</p> <p>To explain again the rating form which you would have received in the mail and the time frame for that and then just to explain what happens from here again. So, people are at least clear about the steps from here.</p> <p>Robert, can I just jump to that slide you had of the flow chart. The flow chart one. Just to put it in some context, you may recall the Water Corp have been using this flowchart throughout the process, so we just want to flag where we are at this point in time. So, if you have a look at that there, essentially the ranking of sites which this tonight is</p>
--	---

	<p>contributing to, what is the opportunity to complete that is until through to the 31st August. The Water Corporation is working still on its sustainability assessment, what it calls its multi-criteria analysis and you may, for those of you who were here last time, Jenny Pope sought your input into that process. So that process is still ongoing.</p> <p>At that stage, out of those, using that information and this information there would be a recommendation, once the Water Corp has gone through its internal decision making, there has been a process of making some recommendation to the Water Corp executive, that needing to be considered within the Water Corp and then needing to be considered at the level of Minister and Government, leading to some preferred site.</p> <p>Now what this is suggesting here is at some point in that process and that period is not yet known I guess, there would be another public forum where the Water Corp would present its deliberations and its recommendation, that for your information.</p> <p>Now, the point at which that occurs, I guess what is indicated here is as yet unknown. Then of course, you have got the – in the process – and I am not totally familiar with that process, but that’s another process involving input to – opportunity for community input to the preliminary to works and the EPA process around any preferred site. So, we’re at this point and it would be the outcomes of the community ranking, plus the Water Corp’s assessment that would be the basis for its deliberations and its recommendations.</p> <p>So, that is where we are in the process. Recognising that there will be – the original advice I think was, at the last forum that that may well be in September and it still may well be. I guess, it is just not as yet known.</p> <p>2007 – At the July forum it was suggested September 2007, whether that is I guess, the Water Corp may want to comment on that, whether that is still the case is not clear. It may be September, it may be October.</p>
John	Indecipherable from floor
	<p>Listen, can we hold that question. When we get to some of these issues still unresolved, we will come to that point John if that’s OK. So, if you can hold that. OK, so the important issue, I have spoken to a couple of people who were under the impression that tonight was the completion of the rating process. It is not in fact.</p>

The purpose of tonight was in response to a view of some people that they wanted to come together to discuss any unresolved issues and that the opportunity to complete that rating is through until the 31st August which is Friday week. So, people may want to – there have been already, rating forms returned by post to Data Analysis Australia directly. I know some people wish to provide theirs tonight and others may wish to post them in the post tonight.

So, that is where we are at the moment. Some of these unresolved issues we will have an opportunity come back to those, so John has raised one and I would ask you to just hold those when we have an opportunity to highlight those.

If you would, on your chair you should have some material that is a list of responses to questions. Does anyone not have that? It should have been on the chair. Could you just – I just want to explain the background to that so you know what that is.

At the July forum the Water Corp provided, or part of the July forum, a range of information about the four sites. We then had the opportunity at the July forum to discuss that and we went through both. Robert went through some presentation about that and we looked at some of the issues side by side. All of that information is available still in report form in the Mundaring Library and there are a number of people here who have requested hard copies from Steve and that is, if you wish that information, you may want to see Steve. So, that information is available, it is also on the website.

At the forum though, there were a number of people and you may recall we had our hands – asked people to indicate hands – there were a proportion of people who felt they didn't have enough information. There were a larger proportion people who felt they did. But, what we tried to do was accommodate that request that more information be provided and there were a number of people who I spoke to after the forum who suggested issues that they wanted clarified. The transcript was analysed to look at additional issues, and there were a number of people who sent additional issues in to me.

So, what you have got here is 47 questions and issues that were raised subsequent to the July forum. Those 47 issues that the Water Corp has responded now. Now, just because of the nature of getting those issues in, the sort of time frame and responding to them, it wasn't possible to get that out to you prior to the forum, but that information is there and you may want to clarify any issues tonight, or take that information away and consider it.

	<p>The other issue that was raised at some length in the last forum, for those of you who were here, you may recall we had the Noongah elders, representing the Aboriginal custodians of the land who spoke, and you would have seen in the letter that the Water Corporation sent out to participants that it clarified its position on that issue, and for those of you have saw the letter I will re-state what their position was.</p> <p><i>The letter went on – “Water Corp advised that after considering issues raised at the Forum the Water Corp advises that a full Aboriginal ethnographic survey will be conducted on the selected site.”</i></p> <p>The Water Corp suggested that this is in keeping with the recommendations of the Aboriginal archaeological survey of the sites. I know that view may not be accepted by all people, I guess that is the position the Water Corp has taken, that it will be doing a full ethnographic survey on the selected site.</p> <p>Again, that may be an issue you want to raise when we get to discuss these issues. So, what I was going to suggest, basically was that if we take 5 or so minutes, I realise you are not going to have time to digest those questions, but there may be questions that were specifically of concern to you, but you may want to seek some clarification from Robert – if he is able to answer them. Some of them relate to GHD’s responsibility. So, what I would suggest is we take 5 minutes, you may want to get a cup of tea or some food for those people who have just come in. Just take 5 minutes to have a look through those questions and I would ask you if there are any clarifications of any of those matters, I will ask Robert to maybe respond to those in a minute. So, if you would, just take that and have a look through it.</p>
	<p>Break</p>
	<p>What I was just going to ask if Robert – if there is any clarifications on these particular issues, I mean there may well be other issues about the sites that you want to raise that we will come to in a minute. But, any specific clarifications about these issues and I know you have only received the information tonight. I guess the decision that was taken was that they wanted to give you a complete record of the information, rather than an incomplete one and then have to give you another one tonight.</p> <p>So, what I will do, Steve’s got a mike, if there is any clarifications Robert will just try to respond to any questions or clarifications about these issues. We are talking just those 47 outlined there.</p>

	Robert, are you happy – we are just looking at those questions, any clarifications if you can just respond to them, if you are able to.
Robert	Yep.
	We will do it from here.
Diana	<p>I would just like the sort of – I don't think you need to respond to this Robert, but I just want everybody to be clear. No. 40, when I asked the Lavender Patch and Bundelier Homestead, it has got it here as recorded as being the closest property to DEC, which is obviously correct.</p> <p>But the point was that those are the closest properties to <u>a</u> site. You know, closest, that was the question, which you said 'Yes' to. So, those are the closest properties to <u>a</u> potential site and after that obviously it is O'Connor that is the second closest lot of properties and after that it is the Pine Plantation.</p> <p>So, it has to be not to DEC to a potential site, that needed to be re-phrased. No. 40.</p> <p>That is why I asked for clarification and it is right.</p>
	Distant voice.
Diana	Well, that is what I am saying, I asked for that. That was the question I was asking, yes – but that is the question I got 'Yes' to at the last one, so I would like that clarified. And if you looked at the map that is indeed the case and my understanding.
Robert	So Diana, do you want me to respond to question 40? I have checked the Lavender Patch Café and the Bundeliar. They are closer to DEC than any other site. Definitely is closer to the DEC than O'Connor.
DianaO'Connor, that is not the problem, what worriescan't hear.....does everybody understand what I am trying to do. Were are the closest sites? Which are the closest sites?
Robert	In terms of closest sites to private properties, O'Connor has got the closest site. Because I think from the transcript I remember that question was asked and whether you were asking it in relation to DEC?
Diana	Well, looking at the map I have the distinct impression looking at the maps, that in fact Lavender Patch and Bundeliar are

	closing to that site than the homes near O'Connor are close to their site.
Robert	In terms of the private properties that are across Firewood Road or along Mundaring Weir Road but near the Firewood Road junction, they are closer to O'Connor than DEC. I mean, I have got maps so we can actually look at them and refer to them.
Diana	No, you have still not quite got it? Has he? I am asking not whether they are closer to DEC than O'Connor, I am saying if you looked to look at 3 sites, obviously Pine Plantation, the houses are the furthest from that, but does the DEC site have the closest houses to it, or does the O'Connor site?
Robert	Bearing in mind Lavender Patch Café has a resident there, so if you consider that, it is quite close to DEC and likewise for O'Connor there are some properties along Mundaring Road that are just as close to O'Connor. I can't tell you off the top of my head, I will have to go and look at a map and measure it for you if you want. The maps are available and what we could do if measure the distance to the boundary – would that help clarify the question?
Male voice from floor	Indecipherable.
	Is there any other clarification people would seek about any of those issues?
Jo	It is in regard to question 1. So, it is about the detail and environmental assessment of the pipeline route. I had already spoken to Robert and if we can't have a detailed environmental assessment, can we at least have an overall hectareage, or area of land that would needed to be cleared for each of the different sites and I think Robert and Jessica are doing that now.
	Robert, you are having a look at that information now? That is something – so Robert will have a look at that and maybe give us a response. Any other points of clarification about any of those issues? Again, clearly it is going to take time to digest that information, but at least we thought if you wanted to clarify it gives you an opportunity to. No other points of clarification? Yes, Karen?
Karen	No. 47 – regarding the discharge from the water treatment

	<p>plan. Is says an agent from the plant will either be discharged to the nearest creek or stream or piped back to the Helena River Dam stream. Can we know what will be the content of that water that is being discharged and what therefore will be going into the streams.</p>
	<p>Sure – is that Robert’s. You are on multiple tasks Robert.</p>
Robert	<p>The supernatant is really not, I think it contains fairly inert dissolved organics in there that comes out with the sludge. I think it has got a fair bit of pathogen because of the fact that it is with all the sludge that has been removed from the treatment process. Supernatant is a clear liquid, that you would need get EPA permission to discharge it into the creek. It is not, chemical – polylaterite. It might have some traces of alum or polylaterite there in the tonnes with that sludge.</p> <p>I am not sure whether I answered that question properly, but we can provide.....</p> <p>Sorry, I missed that one.</p>
	<p>Which words?</p> <p>Any other points of clarifications. Jo, I will take that one.</p>
Jo	<p>Robert, just going on from what you were saying about supernatants, is that what happens everywhere, that it gets discharged back into creeks, or in other plants do you have other ways of disposing of that?</p>
Robert	<p>Yes. We have to get permission from EPA to discharge into the natural streams and basically, if you don’t take the water – if you discharge into the top of the catchment, there has got time for the natural system to assimilate before you can re-use it and basically that is what we are doing. We are putting it at the top of the lower Helena Catchment and we pump it back, because we use the water.</p>
Jo	<p>So, there are no examples of anywhere you do anything different with it, like transport it off site, or such.</p>
Robert	<p>It is something like you know, you put into the sludge pit, but there is usually, when you allow it to stand you get this clear liquid, so we tend to decant it off and so you allow the sludge to dry out quicker and that sludge basically is fairly inert material and there is just this clear liquid that sits up there that we allow it to decant off and allow the drying process to occur quicker.</p>

Jo	Thanks.
Jessica	I will add a bit to it. We are actually looking to the possibility of trimming back the supernatant to the head of the to recycle it. Yes, but that is being studied.
	Down here, yes. I will take this one, Fiona.
Fiona	Is it something like what they have done on Tank Hill? The way they disburse the water on Tank Hill. They do discharge water from there.
Robert	Distant
Fiona	Yes, but they do discharge water from there. Yes, but they do discharge water.
Robert	Tank Hill when they first commissioned it, they pressure tested it and put the water in there and then they disposed of water from the tank into the sump and it is allowed to gradually discharge into the natural environment.
Fiona	Yes, but a couple of years ago, it was discharging and it was eroding the pipeline. A huge amount of water was.....
Robert	Yes, initially when they did the test on the new tank, that was just commissioned they do a pressure test and they have to dispose of the water in the tank. The put it into the sump, but I think it coincides with the storm event and then with the run off and the discharge from the sump it causes a fair bit of erosion and it is something that I think the Water Corp – I think Sandra O'Neill's.
Fiona	Because I saw the pipeline was nearly being eroded. The pipeline was nearly being eroded from the water coming out.
Robert	We are aware of that, that it was that incident.
Fiona	And also from previous times, there is big erosion coming from the old tanks. Huge – you could fit in the hole in the drain that it had made. I hope they are not going to do that sort of thing.
Robert	I think the aim of the sump near the tank at Tank Hill was meant to attenuate the discharge into the natural environment so that what they do is that you hold the water until the chlorine is removed from the water and then you discharge slowly into the natural system, but unfortunately it happened during a major storm event and the combined flow eroded some of the creeks near the existing pipeline.

Fiona	So, can they do something different with this, can they pipe it or something down to the creek?
Robert	The supernatant yes, I think we have to think about carefully ensuring that the amount that we discharge is not in a large quantity that would erode the natural environment.
Fiona	I hope they do that.
Robert	We will look into that definitely.
	Are there any of specific clarifications on these issues? Yes, just the gentleman here. Borrow this one and Robert can keep that one.
Male voice	<p>Yes, with regard to question 10 and 35, you seem to be playing down the issue of the impact of landowners at the O'Connor site. I would like to know how you drew that conclusion given that the private road terminates 20 metres from my front door.</p> <p>The issue is raised in question 10 and 35. In 10 it is with regard to compensation for landowners affected by the installation of the water treatment plant and in 35 is it asking a question about moving – about the treatment plant that seems to be not available here, the question I am asking is how you draw a conclusion that this is not going to possibly affect landowners when Firewood Road terminates 20 metres from my front door and the chain mesh fence that you are going to put up is approximately 60 metres from my neighbours boundary.</p>
	Robert is that something you can respond to? Question 10.
Robert	<p>So how will people with formal businesses that are affected by the location of the water treatment plant be compensated? I think the question says that, our answer says that, we will work and ensure that the impacts are minimised and therefore we will consider the compensation will not be an issue.</p> <p>In relation to question number 35, there were two parts to this about the length of pipes and also the impact of the traffic. The traffic we will consider that will be no more than a thousand vehicles into that treatment plant, compared with the current traffic load on Mundaring Weir Road, it is small by comparison and therefore we don't think that is going to be significant.</p>

	<p>So therefore we say that it is unlikely to have impact on landowners because really that is considered potable land up there where there was quite significant.</p>
	<p>Was there someone up the back? Yes, just here.</p>
Male Voice	<p>Yes, I was referring to the margin of costs for appearing as Attachment 2. There seem to be some significant anomalies in that breakdown of costs and I don't know unless you can look at a lot more detail as to how you can get them all the same.</p> <p>But, certainly, when I look at the way it is presented and assuming the authority makes a decision on capital cost, then it wouldn't be the first authority that has done that. Then it is almost cut and dried isn't it.</p> <p>So, I would like to know how these costs were arrived at and if they include things like scheduling and MPV's and all the sorts of things that normally go into a decision of this nature.</p>
Robert	<p>We have done costings on the capital and also we done some costs and the cost itemised in some sort of cash flow over time, and also we included some of the pumping costs and these are from annual costs that are also included and they include installation and then they also gone back to the present value in today's costs. In addition, I think they also include the taxation impact as well. So there is a fair bit of costing detail, but you can't budget that simply for the public, the DEC in a very broad profile.</p>
Male voice	<p>Just referring to that question about Firewood Road, I actually asked that question, but I would like hold off to ask the question until when we go through the sites.</p>
Another male voice	<p>Given an expert's question on the costs. The running costs of the plant. The Pine Plantation essentially has the same costs as any other place. But on the previous documentation we were told that the sump had to be pumped out regularly every day and that the running costs of that would be quite considerable. So, I just don't know what to believe. Either it is or it isn't.</p>
	<p>Your question related to the operating costs of the Pine Plantation and an earlier budget that suggested that the operating costs were higher at the Pine Plantation?</p>

Same male voice	<p>It says here the drainage water – if I go back a bit, the path of the course is indicated, it is the WTP is to be located here, that is the Pine Plantation, substantial drainage works will be required to engineer the site out of the catchment.</p> <p>This will require an artificial drainage system that will drain the entire site to a sump. The drainage water will then need to be pumped out of the catchment area. This is a significant alternation of the high quality of the site and it would be very expensive to construct and operate. So the operating costs are identical with all the other sites. That is just contradictory.</p>
Robert	<p>I answered a question at the last forum. I said that the costs of pumping the drainage water from Pine Plantation was not included in the costing and therefore for you as a participant we take note of that operating cost to ensure that when you evaluate the Pine Plantation that there is going to be additional cost component added onto that.</p> <p>Bearing in mind that if you look at the present value the probable cost of Pine Plantation is already the most costly option anyway. So, the additional cost of pumping the drainage water out of that site would make it even more costly, so I am not sure whether this will add any value to the cost information.</p> <p>All I can say is the Pine Plantation is going to be more costly compared to all other sites.</p>
Male	<p>How do your plans to make a comment because a couple of weeks ago a group of us went on a bus trip around the four selected sites. To fill out time I was tending to favour the Pine Plantation site until I discovered in talking to the various members of the Water Corp that it was going to be a drainage problem that would significantly add to the cost.</p> <p>And after looking at the four sites that were shown to us that are considered to be the best location it appears that the DEC site has the least extent, is closer to the Weir, it doesn't have a drainage problem and I must say I have changed my mind after seeing the various options and I am inclined to say at this stage that it looks to me as if the DEC site was the least costly and the least damaging to the environment.</p> <p>So, I just thought I would make that comment and put my point of view.</p>
	<p>Thank you, I am hoping that sort of comment will give him neat September, something to make his day anyway.</p> <p>I just wondered if there is any more clarification that Robert</p>

	can try to address.
Male voice	I would just like to know regarding question 26, the environmental offset package. I guess from what I know it is fairly likely that there will have to be one. Are you able to let us know where that offset package would be?
	The question related to question 26 and just about the environmental offset. Robert can you respond to that one?
Robert	The environmental offset depends on which part is being referred to EPA and that's the latest site and they will either live by the condition of those pipes and the offsets for the one From Water Corp or for that corridor. Currently, the offset I think is based on 150% of the impact area and it will require to buy a clear land and vegetate that to a condition that is satisfactory to the EPA.
Male voice	And I just can't remember exactly which issue that these areas of Water Corp lands at the back of the Weir and near Spring Road.
	Abercorn Road.
Male voice	Abercorn Road – I was just wondering if that would potentially be the same site.
Jessica	Actually, Abercorn Road and ... so that is ...(bad mike – mushy).....and EPA has their offset their near Abercorn Road.
Same male again	On question 5 it is mentioned that the depots successfully relocating to another site, I was just wondering if you were able to let me know of the current footprint of that depot – of this one that has to be moved. How big is it?
	The question is how big it is at the site, or how big the footprint of the new site? Where do you think might be elsewhere? I think the question Robert related to, do you know anything about how big the footprint would be, if that DEC site was moved.
Robert	We only really discuss with DEC the relocation and I think if DEC selected then we shall discuss with DEC about the relocation site, and I think the footprint – I can't tell you, I don't know.
	Any others, Miles you have got one, and then you Martin, and one from

Miles	Just on the offset issue. The EPA is a separate organisation and may require at least 150%, that is their requirement. But the criterion sustainability states that, that they are the offsets and rehabs. Does that mean what it says, that it will impact over and above 150%?
	The question is would it go over 150%? Robert, do you want to respond to that one?
Robert	Well, it is really depending on EPA's conditions and we are doing ...(very fuzzy mike).....the conditions for approval.
	Just a quick one Miles.
Miles	Sorry, but that didn't quite answer the question. The EPA will require 150% and then I am required to pay taxes, but I don't put that down on my sustainability principles. If you put it down on this piece of paper here, it is something that you regard as a priority? Partially how you run your business. So, I think that you are stating there that you would beyond that?
Robert	No, we don't tax your 150%, or 200% or what? I don't think it is any percentage. I mean that chart you are holding.....
Miles	Talking in the distance.....indecipherable.
	Is that enough on that one.
Robert	I can't answer that question because it is subject to conditions of EPA and we have to abide by their conditions, if that enough.
	<p>You may have additional questions or clarifications, Robert and Jessica are available after if you have specific clarifications about those 47 questions. It was an issue that was raised at the last forum that the Water Corp respond to those additional issues, which it has tried to do, and as I said Robert and Jessica are happy to keep trying to respond to questions.</p> <p>What I wanted to do more was actually try to look at – and I will just jump – Robert, can I just jump to this? ‘</p> <p>What I want to try – I know that we have still got a number of issues that people have raised that they want to discuss this evening. One of the purposes of tonight was to actually identify and have an opportunity for people to express their views about these issues or to present any additional views that you have about these issues. What I want to try to do is</p>

	<p>to actually identify what are the issues that you want to discuss in here now, that will essentially be an opportunity to raise questions that are across all sites, or that relate to and individual site. What we are looking at are issues to discuss – remember the point of this discussion is to enable people to be the point where they are comfortable or feel informed enough to do a rating. And they may relate to one site, or they may relate to a number of sites. Now, that is why I am asking people who want to raise those issues to put them on a sheet of paper - I want to get a picture of how many issues there are. We have got a period of time and I want to make sure we allocate time to do those issues.</p> <p>I have also been asked to just highlight an issue raised by the Mundaring Residents Ratepayers Association, who have passed a resolution that they would like me to read at this point which is an issue that falls in the issues to discuss. And it basically says that:</p> <p><i>“An Association meeting on the 21st August 2007 the members passed the following resolution and asked that it be conveyed formally to the Water Corp and that I advised this Forum. The Resolution states that this meeting, which was the meeting of the Progress Association, unanimously resolved that not enough information is available for the community, or any association, to make an informed recommendation on the preferred site for the water treatment plant at Mundaring. Specifically with respect to financial aspects or individual site options, we would be grateful if you would advise the Forum and the Corporation of this resolution.”</i></p> <p>So, one of the issues that I guess, is that some people clearly are of the view that they don't have enough information to complete the rating. The issue of rating we have got, I guess people will have to make a choice about that in terms of whether they feel comfortable doing a rating or not. The process which was put in place is to enable people to do a rating and to submit it by the 31st August. But clearly there are some people who feel that they do not have enough information to do that, but I guess that is an issue that needs to be flagged. The purpose of the discussion tonight was to raise those issues to enable people to do a rating by the 31st August.</p> <p>I don't know if someone wanted to comment – Sam did you want to comment on the Mundaring Ratepayers Association?</p>
Sam	<p>We note that tonight we have in fact had something put on our seats with some additional costings. But, they don't seem to be new costings based on any additional information. They</p>

	<p>are ones that were given to us 12 months ago and I am sure that a lot of other issues have come up with individual sites since then and are going to have a significant bearing on those costs. I don't think those costs are worth the paper they are written on.</p>
	<p>So, I guess we have got one issue which is that there is a view amongst some people and represented by the Progress Association that they don't feel they have enough information to do a rating. I guess the process that we are working to is to continue with the rating by August 31st.</p> <p>I guess people will need to make a judgement for themselves whether they feel comfortable with that process or not. I don't think – we can't change that process now. We can make the decision and inform the Corporation of that.</p> <p>I don't know if anyone wants to respond to that issue, and there may be other people who feel the same way as the Ratepayers Association. I am happy to have that issue raised now.</p>
Male voice	<p>I am bit confused by the comment from the Mundaring Ratepayers Group, is anybody from that group go on the field trip with Sandra ...to get an idea of the actual problems of the various sites that have been singled out by the Water Corp as the most likely sites that they were able to develop. Are you saying that the Mundaring Ratepayers didn't respond to any of that, or what is the reason?</p>
	<p>I don't want to spend a lot of time discussing this issue, but I think it is important we highlight it and recognise it.</p>
Sandra	<p>We have been on every inspection, every time they have had an inspection of all the sites and we know the sites inside out and upside down. No, it is not about the sites themselves, it is about the relative costings of the sites and what they are going to cost in terms of operating.</p>
Diana	<p>I am not quite sure how we are running this at the moment. There are two things that I been saying is, one is the indigenous, I am not going to let it go and that was a very cursory ethnological survey; the others have informed me that they are expecting an ethnographic survey, I don't know which sites are sacred which are not. I have told that some are. We don't know that and we are making a decision here.</p> <p>The other thing that is really bothering me is when we were looking at costing, there is no triple bottom line accounting in it, then environmental and social costs.</p>

	<p>The social costs are kind of looked at, the dollar costs are definitely looked at, the environmental costs aren't looked at at all. I wishwas here tonight to talk about the M..... and the black cockatoo habitat, the, the koala and a few others, who could lose their habitat and this is the advice and they are endangered. The cost is huge and I don't feel that there has been any sort of and as once again the fulcrum is the money bags and not the environment they are not social justice issues, they are on separate sides.</p> <p>So I am very concerned about it. I cannot make a judgement if I don't have the information. It is just not there and some of it Some of it will never be there because the Water Corp even though they claim it, have now gone back to oh well, we will do an ethnographic survey. When we get this site, and then the Minister for section 18 out, we will desecrate it. That is basically what's been disturbing me. The ethnological survey I have been - it is not coming from me, it was cursory, it not accurate at all, it is not even close.</p> <p>So, I am extraordinarily concerned by this, I thought this was going to be a great time to come from Water Corp and both of us get on a learning curve with full and proper consultation with the community. Instead now we are being railroaded and it was shown because if we had done this right from the beginning, we could have provided a timeline to Water Corp and actually had, which is what we were trying to do.</p> <p>So, I am grossly disappointed.</p>
	<p>I recognise that some people are of the view that they don't feel able to complete a rate and I am not sure how to respond to that other than to say, there are also other people who clearly do, and they have had an opportunity to do a rating and we are providing them that opportunity.</p> <p>I guess the people who feel they don't have enough information to do a rating we can acknowledge and highlight that issue formally in this process. But I think the timeframe and the other side to that is we committed to provide people an opportunity to do a rating and we need to provide that.</p>
Male voice	<p>I just wanted to put on the record that I am responding to the comment that you made a few minutes ago about the time frame has been set. We need to make a decision by the 31st August and we can't change that process. The Water Corp has seen fit over the last 18 months to change the process whenever it has suited others or themselves and new sides coming in half way through the process, answering questions, we have been provided enough information about this. There</p>

	<p>is all the information we can get and it doesn't make sense that we have come to a date and it doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to me.</p>
Paul	<p>.....Indecipherable.....</p>
	<p>I guess the challenge we have got is that there are clearly some people who are happy they have got enough information and some who don't.</p>
Paul	<p>It comes down to that right from Forum 1, I asked the question about how much treated water is getting pumped into the Weir, which leads into the desal plant, how much extra is coming, now we are getting another desal plant getting pumped in.</p> <p>Where it all comes back down to, if we are going to have treated water pumped into the Weir, why not pump it straight into a treatment plant, no problems we've had and continue it down the line, which then becomes you make the treatment plant a smaller footprint. Because you don't need as much infrastructure because its usually been treated from one or all desal plant, desal plant 2 that is coming on line – why pump it into dirty water and then pull it back out? Where is all this water coming from?</p> <p>Originally you told us it was going to come from the Helena Pipehead Dam. Well, I don't think there is enough water to supply so many gigalitres or whatever it is, every day. So, where is all this excess water coming from? But my whole bill is, if we can divert that treated water, we could make a smaller footprint. We don't need to make it bigger.</p>
	<p>I think Robert indicated he was going to respond.</p>
Robert	<p>On the later condition, we have from the metropolitan scheme, but there are times when Mundaring Weir will only have a wet year and all the water is sufficient to supply the Goldfields and therefore there is no need to land the water into Mundaring Weir. So, in terms of treatment capacity you have to size the plant on the basis that all the water will be taken from the Weir.</p> <p>However, even if you took the water from the metropolitan scheme, the water is still not sufficiently of quality that is good enough to supply to the Goldfields because of the extensive metal in the system that we have to have the water.....and we don't know what type of water is going to come from the metropolitan system. It can come from groundwater, it can come from another dam, it can be from such other water.</p>

	<p>The metropolitan system is that it is so highly integrated that you have no means of allocating a specific source of the metropolitan area to divert to offload this system here.</p>
	<p>Indecipherable voice from floor</p>
<p>Robert</p>	<p>Currently the Goldfields, we do have draft areas, so we have about 20 gigitalitres that needs to be supplied to the Goldfields. That is the cost and the natural system that does not have enough. Simply ground use you would have to increase the recommendation from the metropolitan scheme. However, during wet years you don't really need to that scheme. It just depends on the year by year basis. How much we will need.</p>
	<p>Can I suggest, I am just concerned about this going backwards and forwards. I mean one of the reasons Robert and Jessica are here is that if there are specific individual questions or clarifications you might want to raise it.</p> <p>I guess what I am keen to do, I want to get those out so we can see what they are and address them in an orderly fashion, otherwise we are spend our time going backwards and forwards. So, what I would ask is if you could take during the break, if you could simply write that big enough text so that I can put it up here and we can see what those issues are, we can work through them in an orderly fashion and if people want to comment on those issues, or raise them, we can give them that opportunity and we can also give other people an opportunity. There is also one person who has put together some information they want to present this evening, that we have provided people with the opportunity in other Forums to do that and so there are some issues that I know people want to discuss. So, what I would ask you, if you have an issue, Karen has raised one. If you could simply note it on there and I will try and place them up here so we can make some judgment about how we are going to proceed with those issues in the time we have got left. And I am talking about issues to enable people to complete rating.</p> <p>So, if you would take some time to do that, take a break, have a cup of tea – coffee and I would like people to just place them up here on this screen, thank you.</p>
	<p>Break</p>
	<p>Can I just ask people to resume back to your seats and we will get underway.</p>

	<p>OK – what I have done arbitrarily, so I will need to, these issues that people have highlighted here go across all four sites. These ones here relate to O'Connor and these ones relate to – oh no, this one relates to O'Connor I think – the control of illegal traffic. The gentleman who put that one. That related to O'Connor. This one relates to Site 1. That one doesn't want to stay up.</p> <p>Now, it is probably hard for you to read some of those, so I will just highlight these issues. This one here asks about comparative around areas cleared for infrastructure, pipelines and power lines. So that is an issue around, I am assuming around, and comparing how much land across sites.</p> <p>There is another one here that relates to that same issue, so I need to leave him knowing how much land will need to be cleared for each site, and specifically how much native land. And what are the offsets.</p> <p>This one says what are the real site costs, when environmental costs are included.</p> <p>This one talks about the impact of the construction period.</p> <p>This one asks about the compensation for land owners.</p> <p>There are two here that touch on the issue of Aboriginal consultation. This one says Aboriginal consultation on only site, what happens if this is negative. Re-visit the whole site selection.</p> <p>This one says indigenous sacred sites and sites of significance, where are they? Can only be sited by ethnographic study.</p> <p>So, those two relate to Aboriginal issues.</p> <p>This one asks about the percentage of vehicle movements weekly and monthly. This one asks about a total lack of triple bottom line accounting, i.e. cost of loss of native vegetation. Lack of fauna surveys, questions not answered after how long Water Corp should not be allowed to score until too late for community.</p> <p>This one again, environmental impact assessment of sites, validity and reliability. How can flora surveys be complete when orchards aren't flowering yet?</p> <p>This one asks about the impact of the 12 metre corridor through the village, 20 metre corridor along Weir Village Road, Allen Road, 16 metre Firewood.</p>
--	---

	<p>These are two questions about Site 1, about pipes. Someone is asking about the diameter and size and length of pipes from Site 1 to the pine forest.</p> <p>This one is about the cost of extra pipes for all sites except Site 1.</p> <p>This one asks, and this is specific to the O'Connor site. Control of illegal traffic in secure areas, NB – motor bikes, off road vehicles.</p> <p>This one about the visual impact from the chain mesh security fencing on Mundaring Weir Road particularly at the O'Connor site.</p> <p>And this one is about the impact on residents near Firewood Road.</p> <p>So, they relate to O'Connor; they relate to Site 1; and they relate to all sites.</p> <p>What I was going to suggest was we work through these initially and then we will move to the site specific ones. I guess what I was going to ask is if the people who posed that issue want to make a statement or offer any comment, some of those we may be able to clarify tonight, some of them we may not. So, I guess what I am suggesting is we work our way through these ones and these ones. So, we work all four and then go to Site 1 in O'Connor.</p> <p>I guess I am just aware of time, we have got about an hour and a bit and I would like to at least get some discussion around these issues.</p> <p>Miles, quickly – yes.</p>
Miles	Indecipherable distant voice
	<p>I am happy to use that, but what I want to do is work our way through these first and then we can incorporate that material you have got when we can. I want to try and get these at least – I am just also aware that Robert is caught up at the moment, so -</p> <p>I guess we have got a problem here with these two issues. I know that the Aboriginal consultation on only one site, what happens if this is negative and the indigenous sacred sites of significance, where are they. I guess we confront a reality that the Water Corp has made their position, has stated their position.</p>

	<p>Distant voice.</p> <p>Steve, can we get the microphone please?</p>
Audience member	<p>I can't quite see where this is going to get us. There is no one here from the Water Corp to answer any of these questions. All of these questions that have been raised in the 47 and they have given us their half-baked answer and we are going to go around the room getting personal opinions on issues we don't have answers to.</p>
	<p>The Water Corp has made their position known on that issue, which we know. People have raised that question.</p>
Audience member	<p>Not even on that, the flora and fauna survey we raised that since last year when they missed it last September. They just said they are not going to give it to us.</p> <p>I can't quite see the point. It is not getting us anywhere.</p>
	<p>Well, I guess what I am working to was that the request of the last Forum was you wanted time to discuss these issues before you moved to a rating.</p>
Female voice	<p>Indecipherable</p>
	<p>The request from the last Forum was that you had the opportunity to raise any issues, discuss them. If we can get a response from the Corporation.</p>
Male voice	<p>It would be good to have somebody here to discuss it with.</p>
	<p>Well, we have got people from the Water Corp here.</p>
Male voice	<p>Who clearly can't answer the questions.</p>
	<p>Well, that one I guess has been answered. It is obviously not answered satisfactorily.</p>
Male voice	<p>Going back to my point, what is the point then? You haven't got the answer.</p>
	<p>What I am trying to do is provide an opportunity for any information that you still require to be provided. You are saying that that information has –</p>
Male voice	<p>There is nobody here to provide it. That is my point.</p>
	<p>Well, Robert is here and Jessica here.</p>

Male voice	And can they shed any light on any of those questions, no, they have been raised in these 47 questions already.
	So, I am not sure – you say, from your point of view you don't see any point in moving through these issues.
Male voice	I doubt that I would find much resistance in the room.
	Well, I am interested to hear other people's views about that. Is this something worth doing, or do people don't see it's worth doing? The point that was requested at the last Forum, you wanted an opportunity before people did the rating to consider these issues.
Female voice	...And I feel sorry for Robert because he keeps 'getting it in the neck' from all of us, but we don't get the answers and we are not getting any more information and if you look at the way some of the answers are phrased in this little document, it is basically blowing raspberries at us. So, why are we – I mean it is pointless. Ken should have been here, in fact, all of Water Corp should have been here to make the last showing. Nobody is here. GHD is not here, no, so we can't even ask them.
Male voice	You didn't even put a keg on for us.
Female voice	So, I guess really, are there any questions up there that anybody feels they can get a meaningful answer to tonight that is going to impact on any choice they need to make. Otherwise, why are we going through this process.
	Well, partly because it was suggested that that is what you wanted to do. But I take your point, that if you are not getting the sort of answers that – sure. Jo – will you give that to Jo?
Jo	Did the Water Corporation know that this was happening tonight, was there undertaking from them that they would attempt to answer these before.
	Well, we didn't know what they were going to be?
Jo	But you must have anticipated that they might have been.
	Well, I guess that was partly the response was that the 47 questions was an attempt to respond to what had been

	communicated back from participants - What were the unanswered questions? So, I mean clearly that was the assumption that they were the questions that were going to be asked and so the responses were provided.
Jo	And you in a position, or Robert, or Steve, or anyone who is here from the Water Corp in a position to actually undertake to make sure that these are answered to the satisfaction of the people here before August 31 st ? Because if so, I don't know what considerate is then.
	That is a very difficult question for me to answer.
Male voice	Question indecipherable.
	Put them on the website. That is all we can do. We are not going to have another Forum.
Male voice	Will they be answered by - distant and indecipherable.
Jo	Things like the pipes etc. – if we were to go through site by site and then we could specify, we could do it as we go, Site 1 we could tick off, look we don't know exactly how much flora etc and make it very clear and this would help us all know where we are at. Let's just hang in there for another hour. We have been here for how many weeks and days and hours, is it worth just trying that?
	Anyone want to comment on that suggestion?
Female voice	That is not any more than one of the critical questions regarding choice of the sites.
Male voice	There are other matters you have to consider apart from the size of the pipes.
Female voice	It's a waste of time.
Distant voice	Relating to flora.
	I guess we can do that and that was in a sense the purpose of what we are trying to do. I guess we have got a much deeper underlying issue that some people –
	Distant voice
	Absolutely, I understand that.

	<p>Distant continuing voice.</p> <p>I think its time to cut down now to one by one, picking Site 1 and going to Site 2 and all just trying in our little minds to get it that way, because the deeper issue will just on and on and on and we will bring it up forever.</p>
	<p>Anyone else want to?</p>
Diane	<p>I just wanted to respond to that and I agree we need to make a decision by a certain time, but I guess, and this is going to sound really cynical I am scared that we are letting the Water Corporation off, from answering some really fundamental questions that people have had for a long time, and In know we are being railroaded, but we are being forced to make this decision when Paul O'Mara I think is his name, has been asking this question –</p>
	<p>He is up the back.</p>
Diana	<p>.. Many times, the indigenous conservation issue has come up many times, so when does the point come where the Water Corporation just fobs us off and fobs us off and in the end we will make a decision even though there are lots of things we didn't get answered. But I understand we also have to – we can't be here for another 365 days.</p>
	<p>Certainly, I think this also captures the tension we have had all through this, is trying to accommodate, clearly that there are very significant interests we have tried to address, they still exist and there are also those with equal views that they want to proceed and do a rating, and so, we have tried to accommodate both of those points of view and the point of this process was to try to enable us to do that.</p> <p>I guess the question of if that information is still inadequate for some people, what is the solution to that and that – given the August 31 thing and the fact that I don't have the authority to make any decision about that now, and I mean we have also had that view expressed by a Progress Association, but certainly my feeling is, what I was wanting to do was to try to do exactly what Diane has said without minimising the reality that there are much deeper concerns that people have, and maybe that is irreconcilable.</p> <p>But I guess we can try to answer some of them tonight, but the.....</p>
	<p>Distant voice from the floor</p>

	Well, I guess the concern is that some of the answer may not address and I guess those people then face a dilemma, do they provide a rating or not.
Miles	Given that we are in this room and that's the end of it, can we just register our dissatisfaction and get on with the business of discussing the points and the sites?
	Well, that is certainly my intention, but at the same time I don't want to simply dismiss the fact that those concerns are very real.
	Distant voice/s. --.....and ignore all of the other points.
	Well, for some people that is true, for other people they – I mean the point that was raised was earlier, was people who have done their rating may be doing their rating just because they feel they have to. But, there are also other people who do feel they want to get on and do a rating. So, we have both those points of view.
Diana	There is one question we can kind of despatch. And that is about the pipes. Can I ask Robert, because this is information that came out of the workshops that we attended on social amenity and the biodiversity ones on rating the sites. Apparently Site 1 with the drying beds of DEC has the least impact footprint in terms of pipeline. Is that right, Robert? That you said you could use the existing pipe, would be used to pump the water up to the drying beds. You would only have to – it was certainly less.
Robert	Site 1, with the option of locating the slush bed and the chlorination facility at either DEC, or O'Connor or Pine Plantation has got the least amount of pipe because you don't need a pipe for that continuously. Potable water from the IWSS, however you need that sludge pipe to be able to transfer the sludge from below the Weir to the sites where you have got the sludge bed which is either DEC, O'Connor or Pine Plantation.
Diana	But, logically DEC is closer isn't it?
Robert	DEC is the closest and therefore it has the least length of pipe involved.
Diana	That is all I wanted to clarify for people here.
	I guess my feeling is recognising that there are clearly questions here which people are not going to be satisfied with

	<p>the response that we try to continue to push through with these. If Robert can answer them, then we will try to resolve them that way. I guess that answer may not be adequate for all people, but that was in a sense what we were planning to do.</p> <p>So, I would continue to work our way through those issues, taking Diana's point that we try to see what information can be discussed.</p> <p>Robert, is it – I am just aware, are we work through these issues we are going to need a response from you if you are able to. Yes? I guess we will need you down the front to do that. OK.</p> <p>We have got one here – Comparative areas cleared for infrastructure, pipelines, powerlines.</p> <p>So, I have got to move from left to right. To the person who raised that issue, is there any question or comments you want to make about that issue? No, OK.</p>
Robert	<p>I just did a quick calculation just on the Pipeline Road to O'Connor, the total length of pipe is about 2.5 kms from below the Weir. There is a combination of a corridor 16 metres wide and also some corridor required for 12 metres wide pipe. 12 metres corridor wide for the pipe. In total, I calculate is about 43,800 square metres for O'Connor; for DEC is about half that, is about 20,400 square metres and for Pine Plantation is about 40,400 square metres. And for Site 1, I haven't calculated that because it is only related to the sludge pipe but because we have three sites to put the sludge, I would imagine that the footprint for the pipe would be much smaller than what you have got for the individual site at O'Connor, DEC or Pine. Is that OK?</p> <p>In terms of the power lines –</p>
	Indecipherable voice from the floor.
Robert	<p>It actually follows the same pipe route for each of those individual sites, except that the corridor will be much smaller because we are talking about smaller pipe for the sludge pipe. So, I think if you try and factor them – I don't know what factor you could apply to them but I would imagine it would be much smaller or even half of what we have got individually for those sites that we have got.</p>
	Indecipherable voice from the floor.

Female voice	<p>Before the 31st is there any way that someone from the Water Corp could undertake to actually calculate those areas, the combinations included, given the smaller corridor and they could be on the website. Just so we can see, it makes a big difference for me when I am looking at which is going to have the biggest impact in terms of clearing native vegetation to actually be able to add that amount.</p> <p>You knew the corridor, but I think in terms of the impact on that station is something that we will not have time to assess them, but we can give you the corridor issue which we can put on the website.</p>
Female	Did you mean you wouldn't have time in terms of the vegetation type and condition?
Robert	No.
Female	Yes, that would be great, thank you.
Robert	<p>There was something about power lines? Our response is that we have to talk to Western Power about the supply to the sites and until we have selected the site, we cannot start detailing how the power lines will go, but what we have got is that the power is the transformer below the Weir that I know that we will probably pick up the power from that point and there are probably options to (stopped in mid-sentence) – second side of Tape 1</p> <p>...below ground and alongside the pipeline route and we would probably consider that and something that we would talk to Western Power, I think for under power we would have to pay some additional costs compared to the overhead powerlines. We would consider that underground power would be best.</p>
	<p>Indecipherable voice from the floor.</p> <p>.... That should all be part of it, that should be part of the cost by Western Power.</p>
Robert	Usually Western Power doesn't like to get involved with the site selection and we would probably not go to them until we have a selection site.
	Indecipherable voice from the floor.
Male voice	The outline that you have just mentioned, the cost they have given here by DEC are twice the costs available at O'Connor and yet you have just mentioned that everything should be

	cheaper at O'Connor because that is the whole thing is smaller. I don't understand how the costs of power supply can be the same for each site, or virtually the same, particularly with DEC power costs being the same at O'Connor. And you have got to run the cable another 4 kms up the road. That just seems crazy.
Robertfrom 6.1 or what?
	Indecipherable voice from the floor.
Male voice	The raw water pipe 6.1 and the cool water pipe 6.2, they are the only items I have got to be cost for the pipelines. If there are other costs perhaps they should be in there, I don't know.
Robert	The power costs are slightly different for each site, like DEC, O'Connor and Pine Plantation, but it is assumed that for Site 1 that the main power cost is to the site below the Weir, so it is all common, whether the sludge bed is located at DEC, O'Connor or Pine Plantation. What was the other question that you asked, was it the pipeline cost?
Male voice	Yes, the other question related to the pipeline costs. You mentioned earlier – about 5 minutes ago – that the area for the pipeline is significantly greater at O'Connor than it is at DEC and yet the costs shown on this spreadsheet for the pipeline at DEC are almost double those at O'Connor, which seems a bit contradictory.
Robert	I think there are three items, one is the what we call the raw water pipe. Currently the raw water pipe is beneath the item under 6.1, but indicates that a similar cost for all sites between DEC, O'Connor and Pine Plantation. What it does is that raw water pipe is really from the Weir to the pumping station.
	Indecipherable voice from the floor.
Robert	I have to sit down and see if I can
	Indecipherable voice from the floor.could we have that clarified as an answer, so discrepancies or apparent discrepancies in the cost of those pipelines between the O'Connor site.
Robert	Yes.
Diana	Or, do we have to make a decision on this, if you put it on the web? Steve McKenzie is going to put it.

Robert	<p>There is a programme in there that actually provides the total pipeline costs and there is some things that I took the distance from one point to the other and some of them are common so I used that, and then the others are different.</p>
	<p>OK – thank you Robert.</p> <p>We have got a question here that is about what real site costs with environmental costs included. I am just picking up the costs issues. Would the person who highlighted that want to make any comments?</p> <p>It says, what are the real site costs when environmental costs included.</p> <p>Robert, I was hoping you would be responding to these if you can. The person who asked that question, doesn't want to make any additional comments. What are the real site costs when environmental costs included?</p>
Robert	<p>We don't include environmental costs because these can be, it is very hard to assess what environmental costs are and likewise, social costs. What we could do is to look at the more tangible one, like the infrastructure costs, like parks and treatment plant and the operating costs.</p> <p>And, in terms of environmental and social impact, we have a table information such as the area impact, the vegetation impact and you use those area impact to make some judgement of the morals between this site and then make the collective assessment based together with the cost of these vegetation impact and then make your own assessment.</p> <p>It is very difficult to assessment environmental costs, I mean, if you establish 3 items, see how we can make a costs analysis on that.</p>
Female Canadian voice	<p>Indecipherable voice from the floor.</p> <p>.....let's take the O'Connor site and let's say you have got an environment of 70 hectares of something, you have to provide at least 140 hectares of site, in that you also have to provide re-planting at the outset, you could very easily do a cost comparison of the site work. For example, if you picked the Pine Plantation where it is mostly degraded and then you have a flat bit where you just use it off the model, that is what I am talking about, you could do it, and you could put that into your cost analysis. You haven't done that and it is very simple. I mean, it is really a cost of that but that is the simplistic way of doing it.</p>

Robert	If you have the figures of areas impacted on and you compare the three sites, isn't that enough for you to judge which site is worse and which site is better? – from an environmental viewpoint.
Female voice	Environmentally, is dieback considered in your costs because there is a lot to do with.....
Robert	Unfortunately, Megan has them here, so.
Female voice	So, that doesn't come into it?
	Robert is saying that is a question that GHD would only be able to answer.
Female voice	Suzanne Brown at one of the forums did say that you would be looking at triple bottom line accounting in terms of environmental impact. I asked the question and I know she answered that – that the Water Corp would be looking at that. And I guess then you just say would that be enough and its something to show. And I guess from a community point of view, wanting to do our own kind of triple bottom line stuff. But when we are trying to balance complicated social impacts and environmental impacts, that should try and put an economic on all of them. It is the only way to try and compare them. So, and then on other models, trying to put an economic value on environmental impacts.
Robert	I always find it difficult, in fact, in a lot of projects we are going for the Sawyers Valley on the environmental impact, we use the original factors, such as area impact of the type of vegetation impacted, the species or the value of that species in terms of the rarity or whether it is on the endangered list. I think you use the fundamental data to assist the value or the impact of the human plan on that site. It is very seldom that I think, in most of our evaluations that we actually put a cost on the environment and likewise on the social as well. We use some sort of basic data like areas impacted on.
	I need to move through these. The issue of impact on construction period. The person who raised that, did you want to make a comment? I am not sure who raised it, you may not.
Karen	No, I didn't have a question with it, I was just wanting to raise awareness that there would be impact on residents, and particularly it could be pointed out that there would be no impact, it says in one of the questions and the answer is there would be no impact and I think there certainly is in the 12 days

	or months construction period.
Robert	<p>Which questions were you referring to?</p> <p>I think that question was related to a location of treatment plant but more specifically to the construction. That in this period of construction definitely there will be impact for all sides and some more than others.</p>
	<p>We have got a couple here about flora and fauna surveys, lack of them, how can surveys be complete when orchids aren't flowering yet.</p> <p>Do the people who raised those want to make any comments?</p>
Greg	<p>Yes, from my point of view coming from a totally environmental interest I cannot comment on those when there have been no more surveys.</p> <p>We had a recent example with the Main Roads that I think the database basically showed that there would be specific species in that area and they found a number of endangered species that to each made a couple of other ones in that science.</p> <p>I am just wanting to know how and why some of those surveys haven't been done here. Even if you are getting theas a prime example, there are other species such as thethat will show up on the database that are potentially in the area, how can fauna surveys not be undertaken? And the same with orchids.</p>
Robert	I think your comment about no surveys done is probably incorrect, we have done some surveys and there are reports that we can show you. I am not sure – have you read them? They are available at the Shire. Not fauna.
	Indecipherable from the floor.
Robert	I can't answer that question, I have to refer to GHD on that. I believe they have done some fauna surveys for some sites, but perhaps for O'Connor they only did the preliminary survey on the vegetation and not fauna. I think for the other 3 sites they probably – no?
Female voice from floor	Indecipherable.....they did some opportunistic samplings of the carnabies that they found in the Pine Plantation and things like that and they notice things when they are walking around, but there is just no systematic monitoring or tapping, no.

<p>Robert</p>	<p>I am not sure of the level of detail of this study of the all four sites for collection purposes. I mean, from our point of view, those preliminary surveys are sufficient to make some judgement of the level of impact. We would do a detailed survey once the site is selected, no doubt and to determine whether there are any species of significance that could be impacted on.</p>
<p>Female voice from floor</p>	<p>.....with the point being that we make our business in, we need to know what impact there are going to be on the fauna. So if we don't know the results of the survey, then we ourselves can't make a decision.</p> <p>I mean, if one was going to impact bandicoots and the other isn't, because on that line, I'll not move the bandicoots into the habitat. Then you might make it as environmentalists, we might make a very different decision based on the results of that. If we had to compare the sites, then we don't know all that.</p>
<p>Robert</p>	<p>But bear in mind that you know the vegetation at O'Connor, there is sort of limited degraded area in DEC and then there is Pine Plantation.</p> <p>I mean is there enough vegetation between each site – would that sort of information be able to make some judgement. Or do you need to actually go down and do a fairly detailed survey for all sites, so you can make that distinction even more clearly? I mean, there is really nothing information to make that distinction now so that you can make that judgement.</p> <p>Certainly O'Connor if you are worried, it is reasonably vegetated and in summer it is degraded, but DEC is definitely a different area you can see. And the pipeline is obviously in a different type of vegetation. And then you have got in mind, do you actually need to go down to the detailed, fairly detailed survey now to make that judgement? I don't think so.</p>
<p>Male voice</p>	<p>I mean for me personally, I would say yes. It is vital information, I do this for a generation, this is my background and for me to make an educated decision on which parcel of land has the least environmental impact from my point of view, I am need all this sort of information.</p> <p>So I guess all I am wanting to say is, to have it formally noted that no one can answer this information for me at this time, so therefore I am not going to be able to make an educated decision, but I am being railroaded into making decisions, so I'll do the best I can. But, it is – not – yep.</p>

Robert	Well, from the information you have you still haven't made some decision. It is just go out on the site and have a look you know, what are they, what can you see. That is a very general question of this site, and make some judgement. I have actually organised tours to the site, I don't know what else we can do, except to actually go and survey and question every owner for all of the four sites.
	I think we might take enough
Female voice from the floor	Indecipherable.....
	I am trying to work my way through these, I will try and address them as best we can. The issue of percentage of vehicle movements weekly or monthly. The person who posed that issue, do they want to make any comment? Is that a question, Robert, you are in a position to answer?
Robert	Are you talking about traffic?
	Number of vehicle movements weekly and monthly.
Robert	It is estimated that there will be about a dozen vehicle movement into the site and that is given in the information to the participant.
	What kind of vehicles?
Robert	The type of vehicles are listed in that information that we mailed out either due to the employee and there are some either delivery or chemicals or trucks. I can't remember the details but there is a table of information that we mailed to all the participants.
	Some of these questions I guess, we have got this one about total lack of triple bottom line, this one is saying the environmental impact assessment limiting reliability. I guess with those issues have been raised. This one is about the questions that answered, I guess that is the issue where people have been highlighting. We have got one here about the, and we have a number here about the pipes. This one here is about the impact of the 12 metre corridor through the village, 20 metre corridor along Weir Village Road, Allen Road, 16 metre Firewood. This has raised the issue about the pipes from Site 1 and this issue the cost of extra pipe for all sites, except Site 1.

	The people who raised those issues, do they want to make a comment at this point?
Miles	Yes, I would like to talk about the pipelines because I think that is something we have under-estimated in our notes and pictures and that I can't show them while there is stuff stuck on the screens. So, as soon as that comes off the screen I would like to talk about the pipes and also about the environmental assessments, the appropriateness and their reliability.
	Indecipherable.....the other people who raised the issue about the pipes, I am not sure who raised that issue? Did you want to make a comment, or?
Female voice	<p>Some time ago, months ago, Mark did a speech and so did Professor B....., and they said, they spoke to understand, so I think about Tamara now who is going to probably give us a little bit more common sense to this, not what we are getting tonight.</p> <p>You can see, you haven't showed us the aerial views of all the sites, we understood it, it was good. Why don't you show us photos so we can understand it?</p>
Male voice	<p>If it's OK with you guys I just want to talk about the pipeline and then we can go to the sites.</p> <p>How does this thing work? Can somebody get me going on this. It's OK.</p> <p>I am going to be as quick as I can. Sorry about this. The pipeline is meant to come from the Weir up to the Village. So we have got to have these pipelines, but you don't have a pipeline like this for Site 1. Coming up from the Weir we would have a pipeline, a contingency pipeline for all the other three sites. I think people haven't really thought about this pipeline, so that is the pipeline, the contingency pipeline is coming up. We will need a contingency pipeline for all the sites coming up through the valley here.</p> <p>On the map that we have been given in that sheet just now, there is this thing here, it says a 12 metre corridor to all sites. Well, that goes adjacent to the existing pipeline and then I sawYoungs is it? In the pub yesterday and asked him about the sites and about the pipeline. He didn't know that there was going to be pipeline coming through here, so exactly where that pipeline is going to go, - here is the existing pipeline, where the mark is on the drawing adjacent to it. It's 12 metres wide, which is wider than this room and it is coming through</p>

there somewhere. So, I think somebody should think about that. That's another view of the pipe, so I couldn't get it to go straight. There is the pipe, there is the pipeline – I am going to put a 12 metre corridor and it's going to go through there according to this map.

OK, so that's coming up to the village, it's 12 metres wide, then if it comes after the village, it's going to go along where theis, 20 metres wide. That's the kept track, all those nice bushes, by a kept track on that 20 metres from the road when I took that photograph.

That's what 12 will look like. That's before and that's afterwards and that's a very conservative estimate. That's not 20 metres, that's actually the size of my wife. I'll explain that one a minute. Less the something or other track, and the top track, that disappears. That all goes. That is an historical photograph.

Anyway, so we need to think about. Alright, when its got to along nearer to this road, this is 700 metres long and you'll be watching it all the way along the Weir Village Road, you then come down andand if you look on map it courses round Allen Road, so it's going to come up here, 20 metres wide, across there, round here, 20 metres wide, two pipelines and 25 metres high and that is going to beso that will be higher than most people and it got to go up Allen Road and then its going to cut across to the DEC site, that's the Pine Plantation. OK, so it's going to sweep around that area and all that's going to go – that corner. And then this is the Hills Activity Centre – so, OK.

When it's going to go up Allen Road, we will be saying, my wife is the same size as the pipeline, so imagine two pipelines, because one takes the water up there and one takes the water back then. The corridor is 20 metres wide, which 1.5 times as wide as this room and that comes along here. OK, that is the height of my wife, OK, so its going to obscure. So, I put my wife in all these places along there, logically, and I have joined with her head and her feet to give you an idea of how big it is. Now, I don't think most people, aware it is a memorial patch. Now, that's the view from the Hills Activity Centre to the road – 20 metres wide will bring you to about here. There are the visitors. Unfortunately, they won't be able to get from the buses to the Hills Activity Centre. OK.

I think we should have had plans indicating where those pipelines were going or think they were, and the impact that they would have had, and I would like to make some other comments, but I will do that when we talk about the individual

	<p>sites.</p> <p>Any comments?</p>
	<p>Any questions of Miles at this stage?</p> <p>What other sites have you got that you are able to provide information about, Miles?</p>
Miles	<p>Shall I talk about it?</p>
	<p>You may as well do it now, because we go onto the other sites.</p> <p>A couple more questions on O'Connor.</p>
Miles	<p>Let me talk about the DEC site. I have got lots of stuff here, I could talk forever, but let me talk about the DEC site to start off with.</p> <p>Alright, that is the DEC site, this is National Park, that is the DEC site, thatPark, I can't actually see much difference between them, they all look pretty nice to me. So, I am a bit concerned about the criteria they have used in assessing the environment. This is degraded land, using back to bush is this degraded land. I value bush, but I also value land other than bush.</p> <p>This is I think the most important photograph of all. The DEC site actually has got quite a lot of bush on it. This land here is not half way to the back of the DEC site. The DEC site has been left untouched because it has been part of the State, part of logging since 1882, so there is all the other land in the area that is State Forest has been continuously cut. So, this back half of the bush here with this in here, OK, has got a lot of – you can see – it's a good site. So, we are actually pulling up some very good bush. Using the criteria that has been used, it doesn't matter how big the tree is, that land still counts as degraded because under storage, but to my way of thinking, as the average person, I would think that that was a fairly nice looking thing. So, for example, the chlorine plant is going to be put there.</p>
Miles	<p>There is going to be a 60 metre tank, 25 metres from the road that is 25 metres. That is 60 metres across about. Will be a bit more than that sorry and it is 10 metres high and it is going to go just there. This is degraded land, completely degraded. A person, to give you an idea of scale. A person would be about that big and that is just by the entrance. But that is degraded because there land here is degraded the under story is gone.</p>

	<p>But the actual bio mass here is significant. The habitat here is significant. Degraded land. Degraded land.</p> <p>DEC site Jacoby Park. Degraded land, Jacoby Park. Apart from that it is quite nice. And I think this looks quite nice. I think bush looks quite nice. I think we need to have a nice criteria as well as the back to bush. That looks quite nice, it'll go on of course.</p> <p>Yes there are degraded areas and they have been drawn to our attention. And I don't dispute that. But it is actually quite a small area. This is one where in the report it says DEC block and note the vegetation. Yes the vegetation is crappy but if you look at the bush back here it is pretty good.</p> <p>At the back of the block this is the back corner. This is going to be used for this sump and some of the drawing there. This is degraded bush it is a pine plantation I can see that on a Christmas card. This is the back of the block this is going to be used as well. This will probably be, I'm not quite sure which bit this is but it is either the chlorine store or it is where the sump is going to go, can't remember which one.</p> <p>And then what we haven't had on the plans is the fencing that is going to go around the chlorine store. This I think is an area of confusion. I think the fence line is here and all this is native bush, this is scaled to native bush. The DEC is confusion here. The DEC site goes up to this verge. This is a road reserve. The road reserve is still verge and bush and it is beautiful. But that goes into the plant. And this is where the drying beds are going to go. This is degraded bush. See the ground is not very good. Oh sorry this little strip here is good.</p> <p>I put my hat down and that is the peak height of the purse.</p> <p>This is where the drying beds are going to go. This is where the drying beds are going to go. Drying beds, drying beds. Right. This is where again the sump thing is going to go. To give you an idea of the scale alright. That is my wife at the bottom. See that tree there? That is my wife there. That is all going to go.</p> <p>There is not a single tree that size on There are some good habitats there but this is degraded land for malt is degraded land. Now they look like good trees to me, I like the look of those. I'm not going to go along and say oh that is degraded land. I would go along there and say oh that's nice as I cycle by. And then there are loads of issues about you know is it heritage. You know I don't sit back. Incidentally if you are curious where they are thinking of going to, this is the</p>
--	--

	<p>site in Bilgomen Road. Yes it is cleared, it is a vast view. It is in Bilgomen Road, so you won't be able to get in and out of Bilgomen Road with pine movers you will have to go through the village.</p> <p>Do you want to see any other slides? I've got zillions of them.</p> <p>Let me just point something out about the DEC site because it didn't come up. Shit... sorry... this is very complicated... is that it? This is not really the one I wanted to do. Degraded environment, degraded, degraded, degraded, degraded, degraded on the right far from the left, degraded. What criteria are you going to use when you judge the environment that is the problem isn't it?</p> <p>Can I just talk about O'Connor just for a few minutes while I am blabbering on because I think I've got some points there.</p>
Male voice	It is actually degraded land. 90% of what I saw are either pines or weed wobbles. There are some other trees there but they are not native. Other than the Wtrees it is all essentially is degraded, they are weeds.
Miles	I've got two things to that. I think the fact that the DEC block there are a lot of natives and I think in that area there is what's called... Professor Jeffery Dalton would it a cultivated environment. I think there is a cultivated environment type again that we need to think about. And I have asked lots of questions about the environment and I am very interested in the environment. But I am also interested in preserving a cultivated environment and I am also interested in preserving heritage. That site is called the DEC site. It doesn't belong to the DEC site. I would prefer to see it called Mundaring Thorough Settlement because that it what it is. Or Port..... because that is what it is. Can I answer your environment questions individually?
Female voice	Given that we really need to get on. You are presenting, and I know you are bias, very clearly bias. But you have presented a really biased thing against the DEC site which is fine. In the name of being a bit more objective could we see some photos of O'Connor? And have you just gone and taken all the degraded bits of O'Connor? Because I have seen some really nice habitat trees on the O'Connor site. So do you have photos of them?
Miles	Ah. Well let me just talk about the O'Connor site.
Colin	We need to move on quickly, Miles, so...Miles I have given you time. I said at the start we needed to allocate ten minutes

	to this. I said that all along.
Miles	You want me to talk about O'Connor.
Colin	Yes I have asked you to talk about O'Connor. And I mean the whole point about this discussion is that people can raise questions as well.
Miles	Well I don't like being called bias because I have tried pretty hard to not be biased.
Male voice	That is a view that was expressed.
Miles	You want the O'Connor sites? This is where the drying beds are located. I stood on a truck and I've done a 360 degree view. It goes down to the pine plantation. The drying beds are going to be between here and the pipeline. Alright. That is what it looks like in the summer. I am not disputing that this is native.
Male voice	Miles all you have done is presented another biased view, this time of the O'Connor site. I know the O'Connor site quite extensively I have lived here most of my life. I lived almost directly opposite and I have been across it many times, many more times than you have ever been mate. And that is a crap photo. That is a very biased photo. All of these photos are biased. And I have just expressed mine.
Miles	Making accusations about people's motives.
Male voice	We are providing an opportunity for people, we have provided opportunities through this. A range of people have provided Power Points. Miles made the request. I said I'd give him ten minutes. That is what we are doing.
Miles	Can I just say then.
Male voice	Just hang on, Miles Max.
Male voice	Look Miles, I think you have done a good job, that's fine. You are a nice guy. But the fact is that the DEC site is a highly degraded site and the O'Connor site has areas of degradation but it is still native. It hasn't had a range of introduced flower beds and introduced non native plants that can very easily be replaced. I might also point out that in the brief discussion I had with Robert, he indicated to me that the pipelines shown on the plant are indicative. They are not drawn to precisely the square inch in which they

	<p>are going to be placed. So to suggest in your drawing that all the intersection around about in Weir Road, Allen Road is going to go is a supposition you made and you should have acknowledged that it was a supposition you made and not made it a statement of fact. Because what you are trying to do in your presentation is persuade us not to support the DEC site. But you are doing that in a very biased way and that is my view only.</p>
Miles	I apologise I....
Male voice	<p>Nevertheless you are entitled to your view. But I would also point out that Robert said to me just a moment ago that it was your intention to put all the pipelines underground. So even if they are in a 20 metre wide corridor they are underground. Not 20 metres wide high.</p> <p>I have challenged with him a moment ago that two pipelines would be in a 20 metre wide corridor because there are 500 kilometres of pipeline to Kalgoorlie. There are only in a six or seven metre wide corridor and you have all seen them. If you haven't whip out to Northam tomorrow and follow it to Northam and you will see it is less than six metres wide.</p> <p>I have also suggested to him just then that they don't have to put it in a different corridor because throughout Perth, major pipelines are under roadways. The pipeline out to the pine plantation could go under Allen Road. It could go under Weir Road until it reaches Allen Road. These are the normal construction practice. So what I am suggesting here is up to this stage I think Water Corp have been quite incredibly patient with all of it.</p> <p>Because we are asking for final detailed drawing propositions before the site is even selected. No one is going to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars doing detailed designs on sites to get us to make a decision on a final site. That is not our role. Their role once we have given an indication of the site and we are not the final decision maker we are only one input into it.</p> <p>If you look back at your earlier drawing all the other stake holders have had input. And they may have had a completely different opinion to us. And Water Corp executive when they make the decision will make it on the basis of all the input not only us. Then they will go and do detail design. When they do detail design your sketch up there said there is a work section.</p> <p>When they go to do their detail design they've got to put that out for public consultation. We have another shot to have a look and say no we don't like the pipeline in that route. We</p>

	<p>want it shifted to this route. Or we want it underground here, not underground there. And we want the power line here or power line there. Those are still to come. The EPA two colleagues up the front have a lot of experience in dealing with the EPA. They will put out the final proposition when they do the drawings to us again for consultation and we will have a chance then to say no we wouldn't like to see that be cleared. We would rather you put the bit of plant over here and leave that bit and so on and so on and so on.</p> <p>Part of this meeting is trying to get the final design criteria and we can't get that off Water Corp and we are quite reasonably expect it now.</p> <p>So my last comment is that I just want to say thank you to Water Corp we are nearly at the end. Although people have argued against them and said they haven't produced the goods I personally believe they have. And I congratulate the offices here for their patients even if their superiors haven't given them all they'd need. They've certainly done a bloody good job. They have been very patient and very understanding. A lot more than I ever would have been. So I thank them for that. I also know that more than there are in this room have already voted. So they have been perfectly happy with the data today.</p>
Miles	<p>Yeah, can I act on Max's. I do appreciate what the Water Corp has done. I think it has been excellent that it has been such an open process. And I think Robert has been particularly patient. Can I just stick with this diagram.</p>
Colin	<p>Couple of slides Miles because we need to move quickly.</p>
Miles	<p>Alright. This land is marked as good. On the plan there is nothing on the O'Connor site that is marked at less than good. This land is actually marked on maps as being gravel and this is a pile of tree trunks, tree stumps. Now can anybody tell me how the tree stumps got there?</p> <p>Well I reckon somebody came in and tipped the ground away from the tree stumps and took the gravel. I think that was a gravel pit. And I don't see how that could be called good. All that. Because the whole area is marked good. And when the whole area is marked as good that data goes into the picture and the computer then takes it from the picture into the table and it takes it from the table into the bar graphs and the bar graphs will be taken down to the offices in Perth where decisions will be made. There is a gravel pit.</p>
Colin	<p>Miles you have had twenty minutes at this stage, you need to</p>

	wind it up.
Miles	There is more good. There is the bar graph of O'Connor there is nothing less than very good. That is not consistent with the observations that I have seen on the site. That is the site that we have been given. I question whether that has been done accurately and I question whether back to bush criteria are the only criteria we should use for assessing the environment. And I would like to thank the Corporation for being so open in their forum process.
Colin	<p>I know Miles has put a lot of work into that. And I appreciate the fact that he did that. One of the challenges that I have in this process is to provide an opportunity for people to express the view on all views. And that was the request that was made. And I accepted Power Points before.</p> <p>There are two issues we haven't yet touched on. And the gentleman raised about the O'Connor site. I am just wondering Robert if it is possible to respond to them I'm not sure. One says the control of illegal traffic in secure areas. The other one asked about the impact of the visual impact from the chain mesh security fencing which I think Robert discussed briefly before. If you want to say anything about those two Robert?</p>
Robert	<p>Control illegal traffic in secured areas, motor bikes, off road vehicles. I can't comment on that because I think the public has got public access to some of those roads. Our concern would be really providing safe traffic into and out of the treatment plant and we would do improvement of the road if needed to provide a safe access for traffic movement into and out of the treatment plant.</p> <p>Visual impact from chain mesh security fencing on Mundaring Weir Road particularly at O'Connor site... we have the ability to set back the fence from the road and provide some vegetation between the road and the fencing. And if needed within our boundary we would preserve areas of vegetation to improve the... reduce the visual impact on the properties. There are some areas that we prefer to keep in our boundaries so that we have control on the vegetation and the growth of that.</p>
Male voice	Nearby residents. But you have answered question ten on those 47 questions as there would be no impact on residents. That there would be no need for compensation because there would be no impact on residents. But you would need to plant trees to reduce the impact.

Robert	I think question ten was related to traffic. Is that correct if I can remember?
Male voice	Question ten was related to how would people with homes or businesses affected by the location of the plant be compensated? I am assuming that means they would?
Male voice	And it would say compensation would not be considered because there would be no issue.
Male voice	We do not consider the compensation will be an issue.
Male voice	Yeah because Water Corp will work to insure that the treatment plant....
Robert	Can I answer the comment from Miles that the vegetation survey there were serious mistakes in there. We have used GHD as a consultant. I think you are questioning and challenging the credibility of GHD and I think it is a serious challenge. And they are in that business of doing environmental surveys and I tend to disagree with what you said. And because they are a credible consultant which we have used. And umm yeah.
Colin	<p>No, no, no, no. It is getting close to 9.30 and I just want to conclude going back to clearly there is still issues for some people unresolved. Robert and Steve have made a commitment to try to address some of those. I have got a record of some of those. I guess that is an issue that the Water Corp are going to have to consider about what are they going to do about those issues that are still unresolved. I can't make a commitment on behalf of them in that regard. But certainly Steve and Robert made a commitment that there were some of those that they could try to get some information on the website before the 31st.</p> <p>In terms of the process we've got to, go back to this slide. We are here now. The process recognising that there are some people who don't feel comfortable with that. We do have the idea that by the 31st of August those people who want to do a rating have that opportunity. Some people may want to provide that to me tonight or you can mail it into Data Analysis of Australia. The Water Corp is still working on its sustainability assessment and then it will go through a process of recommendation executive and government.</p> <p>What is proposed is that at some point in that process and I guess there is no capacity yet to say when that would be that there would be feed back. So there certainly will be feedback on that ranking and a public forum at some point where the</p>

	<p>Water Corp would present its recommendation and its deliberations as to the reasons for that.</p> <p>Then as other people highlighted, then there is the process that then continues after that in terms of input to preliminaries to works and the EPA referral process. So the point we have reached is that we are asking people to complete a rating by the 31st and then there will be a public forum at another point in time as yet unknown for that issue there to be presented.</p> <p>That is the proposed process at this stage. As I understand it Robert and Steve made a commitment that they would try to get some of that information onto the website. Clearly it is not going to address all of the concerns that people have. I am not sure what the response to that will be. I guess we will have to raise that issue. Karen, yes?</p>
Karen	Colin, where does your participation end in this?
Colin	<p>That is a very good question. I don't know the answer to that. In essence my involvement was to this point. So that is something that is unknown yet. There was I guess a request from the Water Corp that depending on when that is that I may be involved in that public forum. So the issue of the community advisory group I was anticipating to meet with that group again one more time and see particularly to discuss what comes out of this process.</p> <p>So the community advisory group that met there has been about 16 or 17 so I would envision another meeting. I am not sure how many of that group, to really just inform you about that process and to I guess discuss what process is going to be best to feed back that information that comes back from the analysis that Data Analysis of Australia will do. So I would envision maybe planning to meet within a couple of weeks. I know most people need at least two weeks to do that. But in terms of when that would be I think that because of these process are unknown it is hard to know when that might be. Unless Robert wanted to make a time.</p>
Robert	<p>We expect that once we get the information from the community rating and once we get the results from the MCA we will use both information to assess them. We assess them and we will make a judgement on the site. And there will only be one more meeting. And that meeting is really just informing the community of the decision of the outcome. However once the preferred site has been selected there is this whole process of referral to the EPA and you've still got the ability to give feedback into the proposal. If I can show you what that...</p> <p>So you still have the ability to provide input to the referral to</p>

	<p>the EPA and the preliminary of works. And bearing in mind that this process doesn't end for us because we've still got to do a fair bit of engineering and studies like detail studies of flora and fauna on the selected site. And we will put in detail exactly what makes the site, the alignment of the pipeline, and we will do proper surveys and try and pin it down more precisely. And all this information will be of a much greater level than what we've got and they will be available for the community to input to different processes that will occur. Alright?</p>
Colin	<p>O.K. listen, I am aware that we have gone a little bit over time. I think we will wind it up. Can I just thank you all? I know a lot of people put in a lot of time and effort and energy. Thank you very much. I would like to also acknowledge Robert and Steve and Jessica who have really... Robert has taken on an enormous load and I thank you.</p> <p>Thank you for contributing and certainly I will continue to push these issues forward. The one thing I should have flagged is that all of you will get a report back from Data Analysis Australia with the details of that rating process. Thank you very much for your attendance and I hope we are finishing at 9.30.</p>
Female voice	Colin, will these things be.....(not audible)