

The Water Corporation Mundaring Deliberative Forum

Forum 8- 14th May 2007

[Opening of Meeting]

Presentation-

Colin Penter: Ok. Firstly, thank you for coming out on a Monday night. Can I just let you know that there are documents on the seats. So if anyone hasn't got those, you may want to grab them from one of the seats.

I've got seven apologies from Fiona Jordan, Jenny Mills, Sharon Davies, Steven McKiernan, Jaye Radisich, Mike Davies and Pauline Newman. Are there any other apologies? Paul Benson from Sawyers Valley. Any other apologies you'd like recorded?

There are a number of people who may not have attended earlier forums who've come this evening subsequent to the information that was circulated or to information that you would have received. For those who don't know, my name is Colin Penter. My role is the independent facilitator for this process of site selection for the proposed treatment plant. I am contracted by the Water Corporation in that role but I'm not a Water Corporation employee, so my role is to be independent of the Water Corp and to try to facilitate this process. So welcome to those people who haven't attended previously.

Just to clarify the purpose of this evening, it is essentially an information update session. So the purpose will be to try to provide you with an update of the progress and the process since the last forum at the end of November and to provide you with an outline of the future plans. There have been a number of tasks that have either commenced or part-completed since the November forum and there'll be an update on those tonight.

But this is a progress update because a lot of that is incomplete so it is a progress update. So the purpose is not to really go down in detail into the four sites or the proposed plant tonight, but you may have questions or issues you'd like clarified around those issues.

Robert, can I just have that second slide. In terms of timeframes, this is what we'll try to get out of here by 8:30. What we hope to do is provide you with an update of what's happened since the November forum; then, to provide you with an outline of the process from here and particularly a timeframe or a proposed timeframe and a proposed process that we can discuss further tonight. The Water Corporation will talk about that later.

What we'll do; a number of the speakers do have to go so we will have questions at the completion of their presentations but we'll also have an opportunity for comments and questions at the end. And we'll be out of here hopefully by 8:30.

Robert, can I get that. Just very quickly, I just want to give you an overview of some of things that have happened since the November forum.

Now the next part of the evening, there'll be people that will give you more details about these. So, I'm just going to explain some of the things that have happened and then people will talk specifically to those.

One of the first tasks that happened was that the Water Corporation contracted an independent statistical and mathematical company – Data Analysis Australia –to do an independent analysis of the ratings that were completed by the Participants at the last forum in November. And you should've received a copy of the DIA report and John Henstridge who is the managing director of Data Analysis Australia is here tonight to talk briefly to that report and answer any questions. John, thank you for coming and I'll introduce John in a minute.

The Water Corporation, as part of its own internal assessment, undertook what it called an internal sustainability assessment on the eleven sites. So that was the

eleven sites that were considered at the November forum and Suzanne Brown from the Water Corporation will talk about that this evening.

The Water Corp has employed some specialist consultants to provide it with advice on specific matters and I just listed some of them there. The issue of wanting more detail about the treatment process, as I understand, they have contracted an engineering company called WorleyParsons, who are currently undertaking that work. That work, as I understand, will be available to this forum. They have commissioned an Aboriginal heritage survey and some consultations with indigenous stakeholders. There will be a brief report on that tonight, although it's still underway.

The Water Corporation has commissioned a preliminary risk assessment on the four sites and that work is still underway and some of that will be talked about tonight.

The Water Corp is currently in the process of putting together detailed-site specific information on the four sites and that will be distributed to all the Participants when it is complete. Robert will talk about that tonight.

Currently the Water Corporation is consulting with key government stakeholders and other stakeholders such as local government; national trust about the four sites and that information will also be available when it's completed. And again Robert will talk to that a bit later on.

There have been two meetings of the Community Advisory Group that advises me. There are about 32 people who are part of that. I think we had a meeting in March, sorry, meeting in April and a meeting recently. In fact, it was the advisory group that requested this update meeting be held and other meetings planned in June.

In conjunction with some of the members of that advisory group, the Water Corporation has worked to define the boundaries, particularly of the O'Connor site and you have a map of that work on the table, on the chair. Robert will talk a little about that this evening.

The other issue that's happened is the letter that went out from the Water Corporation raised some concerns about the fact that it was appearing as though the Water Corp would be making its recommendation to this forum for the forum to consider. There was a considerable concern about that within the advisory group and I was asked to communicate that to the Water Corp who have then subsequently agreed that this forum will be involved in a process to rank the final four sites for consideration based on the detailed information provided. In other words, you will have access to the information that the Water Corporation are putting together to do a ranking of the final four sites and Robert again will talk about that this evening.

So all of those things, you will get some information on tonight and you may have questions. Part of the reason for the meeting tonight is a lot of those things are still underway and it was considered important to provide an update of the progress rather than wait to that being completed.

So if, what I suggest if we push on and we hear from Dr John Henstridge, who is the managing director of Data Analysis Australia. DAA is an independent and one of Australia's leading statistical and mathematical consultancies. And I say that is no exaggeration. DAA are recognised Australia-wide for their statistical and mathematical expertise and I'm very familiar with their work and it's highly ethical and highly reputed. The Water Corp contracted DAA to do an independent analysis of the ratings from the last forum and John will talk to that.

John Henstridge: Ok, I'm not used to using a microphone but I usually rely on my scout leader voice. Ok. Right.

What Data Analysis Australia was asked to do here was to come up with a rigorous evaluation of the results from the consultation process, which had the Participants going through two sessions citing what was important firstly, and secondly rating a number of the sites.

This had to cope with the fact that there was a variety of opinion being expressed and furthermore that the rating methods didn't mean everybody rated every possible site. To keep the load or burden off the Participants reasonable, they were asked to look at firstly what sites they thought were good candidates and then to actually rate those more accurately.

At the end of this, my understanding was that the intention was to come up with some sites that would go to the next stage of further consideration. So it's not simply a matter of pulling out the best one, but rather to work out which ones would require further examination. And I say that upfront because one of the outcomes of this analysis is that there're a number of sites which are actually ranked very similarly by the Participants. That means that at the end of the day, the decision, if it's made out of those ones, will be made on other grounds. In other words, the consultation process said very similar level of preference for them so therefore other factors would probably be the citing ones there.

Next one. Ok. At the earlier advisory committee, Robert presented a chart that looked like this or very similar to this, which gave a very simple sort of raw score view of the second stage of the consultation process. Now, in one sense it would have been impossible to run with that and say that's it. Mathematicians are often accused of being able to say you know, 'I can make it a lot more complicated than that' but rather than introduce complication for complication's sake, what we were trying to do was to come up with an analysis which would stand up in a sense. In other words, we wanted to make sure that the analysis would actually have an interpretation that was reliable; that there wasn't some other way of approaching the data which will give a dramatically different result. And I just mention one site in that regard, which I think is the Tank Hill site. People that rated that rated it very very highly but most people didn't think it was worth rating. So in a sense you are going to have to come up with a method which can handle that situation where some people think it's very very good but most people didn't consider it worth rating. So the analysis that we did had to be able to handle a situation like that with unbalanced sort of responses.

Firstly, the analysis looked more for confirmation processes than anything else to see that the first stage, which is selected sites, had actually functioned in a

reasonably logical manner. If we hadn't been satisfied at the first session, where people decided which sites they would rate in detail. If we decided that hadn't worked very well, then we'd actually have to review the second stage in a rather different way. I won't go into the actual mathematics of what we did here but that was it. This is the stage where I say to my clients, 'trust me, I'm a statistician'. But basically it came out with things looking reasonable sensible. This is sometimes called a tornado diagram for reasons I don't entirely know but basically the environmental impact was considerably the most critical thing in influencing people's decisions as to whether to proceed to rate a site at the next stage, right down to economic and financial factors were the least important in making that decision.

Overall this made sense but if people actually said that safety for residents was an important factor in choosing a site, they said yes to that, they were more likely to choose a site for further examination than if they had said no. So that first stage from my perspective worked logically. However, most of the analysis concentrated on the second stage and for that we actually looked at several different ways of doing it. Now we could've just done averages but that actually gave some results that to be honest depending on how you do the averages, do we average the ones that people have answered, do you implicitly give a zero score for the ones they haven't answered. There're lots of different ways you can do that. Averages often don't work very well and secondly it was quite clear that some people in session 2 were either marking things as being sort of a 5 or a 1. Some people actually think sort of very black and white and some people were using more shades of grey. And that's quite common when people in a sense haven't been really trained to do rating processes and standardised things like that. So for those two reasons, what we actually used in the end was what as a statistician I call ranks; look at the order in which the final ratings appeared for everybody. And then what we tried to do is to come up with an ordering which agreed best with what people had as individuals rated things.

So the advantages of this is that it actually makes very few assumptions about the data. It's about the most reliable way you can do things. There's a technical appendix in our report which is probably unduly mathematical so I apologise for that when I was preparing for this. This afternoon I was thinking I'll give a very simple explanation for it. All it's doing it's quite simple. It's actually saying there; it might be an overall ranking and there might be a Participant and either that Participant orders

things in the same way as the overall ranking that they give as an agreement or that a Participant ranks them differently. Here, I just got two things around the other way. And basically all you do is try to choose an overall ranking which maximises the agreement with everybody in terms of the way they look at each pair. It's a methacort concordances. It's been around in other contexts of statistics for a long time.

When I first started using this method for some projects 15 years ago, it was very difficult because its computation is rather intensive but these days is quite easy to do. Now there's one issue we had to consider in doing this, if we go to the next slide, some people didn't rate all of the or most people only rated about three or four sites, the maximum was about five sites that somebody rated. It's just a matter of what information do we read into that, if somebody didn't rate something, then in some sense they've said it's not worth rating. Implicitly, you might say they are rating it lower than all the other sites that they did rate. So that's one reading that you put into it, but the trouble is with that the session two uses a bit of a different methodology. It tried to get people to think a bit harder and dig a bit deeper, so you can't be absolutely sure that there weren't some other sites that people rated that didn't bother to rate in session 2 wouldn't have been rated reasonably well if they'd gone to that stage. Can't be absolutely sure, it's unlikely but you can't be sure.

So if we go over. So what we actually did, next slide, we actually did both because this is the one area of uncertainty in the analysis; what meaning do you attach to the ones people said 'I'm not going to rate them.' And if you actually say or they said I not rating them, they said that they regard them as less preferable and you put on one ordering of the sites. If you don't make that assumption, you come up with a slightly different order. Now with the top three here are the same, the same order, the same three regardless of what method you use. And in fact that's quite consistent with the chart that Robert had produced at the last advisory committee with those top three sites. Site 1, the Department of Environment and Conservation Land and the pine plantation, they stand out. And to be honest, all the other methods we looked at as well, they always come out in the top three. So there's not really any dispute about that at all.

The next two, just click again, the next two, the O'Connor site and the site 1 kilometre below the Weir, they come up in a different ordering depending on what you do. Now that's sort of a level of uncertainty there and that's why in my report my comment was that while I'm inclined to prefer this ranking here, if it was possible to actually do further investigation of the five sites, I would say that just satisfy this uncertainty here by doing these five. The rest of them, just click again, the last seven, they actually rank quite a long way further down. And in a sense you can see that they are, the ordering quite different from these two there and that's basically because very few people actually rated those sites there. So it's rather imprecise because people didn't bother to rate them. So in a sense they were almost excluded at the session 1 stage there.

So that's really what the analysis came up with. Now of these as I said earlier on these top three really came out almost level pegging. But it only would've taken one or two people to give a slightly different answer for that ordering to change. So don't read too much into this ordering of those top three. The next two as I say you could argue about them. There's a slight preference I think for the first ordering I got there, so that would've looked at the O'Connor site number 4. The last seven there are effectively not given a high rating from most people.

Click on again. So as I've said there, it really comes into three groups, the top three, the next two and the remaining seven there. So that's really what the analysis is, it's actually not, it's not rocket science, it's not dam squid science, sorry. It's relatively simple analysis and as I said earlier on, we looked at this from a number of different perspectives and this is a consistent result that comes through. You can scratch around a lot further and you are not going to come up which is significantly different, I don't think.

Colin Penter: What I suggest is we take any questions in relation to John's paper or the report or the presentation that you might want to ask and then John can depart. And we got a microphone if someone wants to ask a question.

(inaudible)

John: We won't argue with the comments because we agree with them.

Colin Penter: The question was will it be available on the web. I guess that's a question that...the answer was the report was mailed to everybody who registered. There are hard copies over there for anyone who doesn't have a copy. The Water Corporation just said that they will put it as well on to the web.

Any other question for John? No, ok. John thanks very much for coming out on a Monday. Sorry. Yeah.

PARTICIPANT: I don't know what the program was, what they actually looked at or anything you know. So I'm sort of in the dark at the moment. Like you are saying that the sites were chosen but on what sort of grounds were they chosen or...

John: My understanding is that the sites were chosen at some earlier stages possible sites. I was asked to assist after this rating process had been done with the community. Now I'm not the right person to answer the question as to just all the events that led up to there. My understanding is the Colin facilitated the sessions where the consultation and the session were carried out. So I'm only one step ahead of you in that sense.

PARTICIPANT: Yeah, one more thing, is it for the local community or is this for all the way out to Kalgoorlie.

John: Essentially up till now, it's been primarily for people living within the boundaries for the Shire of Mundaring and probably part of the Shire of Kalamunda would be my understanding. Would that be right Ken? '

PARTICIPANT: Like I said, I haven't been given any information. It was only after I was able to go home the other day and find some paperwork for the first time at my house, you know.

Colin: I mean just to perhaps try to explain that as best as I can, there were 11 possible sites or 10 possible sites identified. It was then a process of trying to work through the identification of criteria by which those sites could be narrowed down. There was then one site added into the mix probably October, September of last year, so part way through that process and that was the O'Connor site and that was in response to some suggestions from within the community so then there were 11 sites and then there was a process that was about 48 people here in November went through assessing those 11 sites to try and narrow them down to a smaller number for more detailed assessment. And four of those four sites were the ones that John was talking to. So now the process is to do a more detailed assessment of those four sites to see if there is a preferred option. And you are right, the Water Corp has informed some of the people who are affected by the O'Connor site in preparation for tonight's meeting. So that's why you would've only just received the information. Did you want to comment Ken?

Ken: Any new members that are here for the first time or even haven't got all the information see Steve or myself and we'll supply you with all the information that everyone else has had up for the last 15 months. And Steve will give you a briefing on where we are and what it's all about.

PARTICIPANT: My house is in the CALM department so my house looks like it could get bulldozed and I haven't been told anything about it you know. Yup [inaudible] thanks a lot.

Colin: Ok, any other questions or comments at this stage. What we'll... can I just go back to the second slide? Ok, in part of the update of what's happened, post the November forum, the Water Corp then did its own internal sustainability assessment on the eleven sites. And the reason for that was clearly within their responsibilities, they needed to test out their own assessment of those 11 sites and Suzanne is going to talk about that process now. So this was an internal process that the Water Corp went through and she'll explain the process and some of the outcomes. I think, is there a document on the table Suzanne? Ok, so Suzanne will talk to that as well.

Suzanne's had an injury as you can tell, so she's a bit immobile so we'll just put it up here for her.

Suzanne: Thanks Colin. I don't have a spare hand so I'll need the stand. The slide that we got up at the moment...

(end of tape 1 side A)

(beginning of tape 1 side B)

Suzanne: You should recognise that as possibly one of the first flights that we had up in 18 months or so ago.

The internal Water Corp sustainability assessment, we mentioned pretty much at the first forum that this is something we were going to do because the Water Corporation has its own sustainability principals that we've been working on for the last couple of years. We've had agreement from the board that this is how we test new projects.

Obviously for each project then, we have to come up with criteria under those principals because they're fairly broad ranging principals like net environmental benefit and net social benefit. So for each project, we develop appropriate criteria.

So for this project, we got all together in a room with the appropriate internal and consulting experts on these issues, like environmental and botanical, social impact assessment. And agreed on some environmental, some sustainability criteria that matched our principals – that weren't in conflict with any of our principals and then went through a very simple rating process against each criteria for each of the eleven sites.

So where we are at the...do you want to flash it up Robert? Where we are on the flow chart is going through our parallel process. So while we've been working with you guys on one process, we've also internally been doing some checking whether

internal sustainability principals, just to make sure we are not violating any of those principals. So where Robert is flashing the little arrow up and down is where we've come down to and the next step down the bottom is the sustainability assessment using the multi-criteria analysis against the top sites that came out of our own internal assessment. Now Jenny Pope over here will talk about that at a later stage tonight. But what I'll go through is just the next (slide Robert ... Oh Sorry I thought you were bringing up the results of the wheel ... this one.) Now that's far too busy to look at which is why I got it print it out on an A3 sheet and you can take it home and look at it as well. Basically, at the end of this process you come up with the wheels with the most colours on them are the best sites to go with. It's a very simple, very blunt instrument.

The better a site does against a certain criteria, the higher rating you give it. It's really just a comparative tool that we use internally and nicely. It turns out that the top four sites we believe matched with the top four sites that we developed in the community forum in November. So it means that we are on track, as far as our own criteria internally, and it means that our internal assessment processes look quite robust, I believe. And it means that we've adapted according to the criteria that you guys have come up with.

Now, we also have on the agenda that we are going to talk about the indigenous consultation processes. Do you want me to go through that now? Ok, now.

Our own internal indigenous resources section has been addressing that issue separately. Right at the very beginning of this forum process 18 months or so ago, we invited relevant indigenous groups to participate in this process. Although, we did recognise if they didn't want to be included as part of this process, we would consult with them separately anyway. They've taken us up on that as a separate parallel process and at several of these forums, we've been asked how it's going and what we are doing, making sure we don't neglect that as an important criteria and an important statutory approvals process as well. So just to update you, we've conducted desktop studies of the general area. So we check all our own databases and other government agencies' databases to find potential aboriginal heritage sites. We've also engaged Australian Interaction consultants who are Aboriginal Heritage survey experts to do a survey of the general area plus the four, the top four sites,

specifically on those sites. They have consulted with and as well as the Water Corporation consulted with the South West Aboriginal Land and Sea Council to determine the right informant groups to consult with. The archaeological investigation was conducted a couple of weeks ago and there's some more work being done this week. We expect our final report by the end of the month and all of that information will be ready for you guys as a forum to look at once we do the next step, which is when you will be ranking the four sites, the top four sites.

So if anyone's got any general questions about that process or about the sustainability, the Water Corporation sustainability analysis, I'm happy to answer them now. If it's a more detailed question about individual sites and the Aboriginal Heritage issues, I'll give you the contact details of the indigenous resources section people because they'll be able to answer the more detailed stuff. And I'll be here all night so if you have question later, just grab me.

Colin: Can I suggest you take any questions, typically on either the internal processes or the evaluation entry or the issue on Aboriginal interests?

Suzanne: Let me sit down.

PARTICIPANT: I noticed the affordabilityand yet the capital is listed on the attachments, the capital is quite different for each site.

Suzanne: Do you want to comment on that Robert cause I'm an environmental person not a finance person.

Robert: Yes, under affordability there were some criteria that were set by our financial evaluation branch. It was set at a threshold value of 25 million but this project is far beyond 25 million. So we were sort of not plan what to do with these criteria so we made sure that all ranking for that particular criterion is the same for all the sites. But the things is that it also covered under what it's called the 'net present value,' the capital costs, so we thought that it's also covered. But all it was said as one of

criteria, we thought we had to leave it as such but all of them have the same ranking.
Ok?

Suzanne: I guess it means that none of them fail the affordability test because if we've gone back to the original 27 sites and ranked those, the really really expensive one would've failed.

So these 11 already pass the test because we've ruled the other ones out. Put it simply.

Do you want to wait for the microphone because I can't hear you.

PARTICIPANT: Just with the colours obviously if they go all the way to the outside, they are the most important.

Suzanne: If they go all the way to the outside, it means they are rated really well, not most important necessarily, this is not weighted, this is just ranking individual criteria and saying how well does it do.

PARTICIPANT: And the colours, different colours don't mean anything ...?

Suzanne: Well the different colours, I think red is environmental; green is....One is social, one is economic and one is environmental. I can't see it. Red is economic, green is environment and blue is social.

PARTICIPANT: I have a question on the wheel. For instance, if you look at the buffer zone chemical, the colour coming out from the centre, what is the advance to the periphery of the circle indicate? For instance in that buffer zone chemical mean, I don't understand what it's telling us.

Robert: Which side, side one was it?

PARTICIPANT: Side one or two or any of them. What is the buffer zone chemical? That's the bottom left hand corner...

Suzanne: That was making sure that each site had either an adequate buffer zone or how the buffer zone rated against other sites.

PARTICIPANT: So site 1 isn't as good as site 2, by one division, is that right?

Suzanne: Yeah.

PARTICIPANT: And what does that mean?

Suzanne: If you were choosing a site just based on how good its buffer zone was, you'd choose the one that had the most in that quadrant. It's a really really rough, blunt instrument I guess. It's just used to compare sites against sites, so you can do it two ways. One, you could go through each site and rank each criteria or you could go criteria by criteria for each site, so you can say buffer zones for all the sites and then rank them that way.

PARTICIPANT: Well, all I can say is it's really really rough to me. Thank you.

Suzanne: It's not dissimilar, I think to the way this forum ranked the sites in the last forum in November, where you had developed your own set of criteria and decided amongst the groups how you were going to rank your sites and then ranked them. This is just a different way of pictorially representing I guess. Engineers like maps and diagrams in pictures rather than I like this site, so it's a good way of pictorially representing how each site rates across the criteria.

PARTICIPANT: Yeah with most of these sites which have been chosen, they are all sort of in the catchment area of the lower Helena. If there's any contamination, it would head straight down through the creek systems to the lower Helena.

Suzanne: That would be a risk issue that we consider very carefully because obviously is not in our interest to contaminate our drinking water catchments so I take your point.

PARTICIPANT: How come you haven't chosen the other side of the hills where if there was any disturbance from the buildings, silt from disturbance, any chemical spills which would be going the other way which would be able to contain. A lot of these sites, if there was a major sort of site silt problem or whatever, would be running straight into the lower Helena.

Suzanne: I haven't got the catchment boundaries right in front of me, but I don't think all of the sites are in lower Helena drinking water catchment, I know some of them are. I guess the short answer is, it would be an impact that we would have to, a risk that we would have to make sure that it was managed really carefully and it would be part of the impact assessment as we went further into the four top sites, if you see what I mean.

PARTICIPANT: With site 1 you got it sort of quite high environmental and when you look at it, it's very low.

Suzanne: Yeah, basically the further away you get from the reservoir itself, the more expensive it gets as well. The other sites further away from the reservoir, a lot of them were in private ownership and we made a commitment very early on that there would be no compulsory acquisition of private land. So that sort of rules some of those sites further out, out of contention.

PARTICIPANT: Even from the McCallum Road though, the water table takes a long time to sort of start to flow back to those, like the lower Helena and everything there.

Suzanne: Look I'm very happy to talk in more detail with you about this because you are one of the new Participants?

PARTICIPANT: Like I said I haven't been invited...

Suzanne: Yeah, I understand that but I'm more than happy to talk in a lot more detail about this rather than just get bogged down in one question. It will be an issue we have to address, because it's not in our interest to contaminate our own reservoirs.

PARTICIPANT: Thanks.

Colin: Are there any other questions you might ...

PARTICIPANT: Just the sustainability assessment chart, are they desirable compared with one another or just on the sustainability assessment?

Suzanne: Just on the sustainability assessment.

PARTICIPANT: What is their desirability compared to each... one another.

Suzanne: They were considered independently but to give them a ranking, it was this one is better than that one. So they were considered independent of each other.

PARTICIPANT: So they are not ranked against one another, they are ranked against just sustainability.

Suzanne: No, no.

PARTICIPANT: Thanks

PARTICIPANT: Ok, this is the first I've heard of the O'Connor site, and I'm just wondering from the areal photograph, it all looks like bushland.

Suzanne: It is a vegetated site, Robert's got some more boundaries and more details about the site in his presentation so do you want to see if he answers your questions and then I can come back to you?

PARTICIPANT: I'm just wondering how the O'Connor site stills falls into the two-band?

Suzanne: It still falls into the two-band because I mean I'm with you, I don't want to chop down any trees that we don't have to.

PARTICIPANT: Yeah, I just don't really understand

Suzanne: But the criteria were based on things like if it's on a national park, it scored really badly. If it was highly vegetated and good quality vegetation, it would still score badly, you know highly undesirable to do that. If it's vegetation that is well represented in the region, then it wouldn't have scored so badly and from memory I think that's how we rated that site.

PARTICIPANT (MAN): Yup no worries

Suzanne: Ok. I also want to point out this is, I mean the Water Corp's done this very rough assessment based on the knowledge that we have so far. This doesn't mean that this is our preferred site. This is one site that we are not yet prepared to knock out of contention and go to government in three or six months or whatever and say we've chosen the site whatever and they then turn around and say 'Well, why did you knock out that site?' We are trying to get the most robust decision made on which site we go with and so your parallel process that we are doing with you guys to come up with a preferred community preferred site and our internal analysis is just to make sure that we don't overlook a site that potentially is a good one. So we are not saying

we are going to go for that one because it's got lots of trees and we are going to knock it over.

PARTICIPANT: Suzanne my question is really similar to Greg's. If you look at CALM depot in site 5, I don't really understand the clearing.

Suzanne: My understanding of the CALM depot is that it was a lot of non-indigenous vegetation.

PARTICIPANT: There's still some native stuff on there though Jill, if you look at site 5, which I think is Tank Hill that's all native vegetation.

Suzanne: Site 5 isn't Tank Hill, is it? [inaudible] It is...

PARTICIPANT: So I'm really confused why you are clearing for site 5 if it's only one bar...

Suzanne: Because it scores really badly.

PARTICIPANT: So it's an inverse scoring...

Suzanne: Yes, if it's not desirable you give it the really low score, so site 5 which is Tank Hill National Park, high quality vegetation, it scored really badly because you wouldn't want to go there. So that the wheels with the most colour on them are the ones we will go forward with in terms of more analysis.

PARTICIPANT: Least impact

Suzanne: Yes, well not necessarily least impact but either most manageable impact or least impact, so most desirable.

PARTICIPANT: I'm curious to know how the Water Corp did their analysis on O'Connor Hill when there was no site boundary decided until the 11th of April.

Suzanne: It's a good question. We did it on the sort of general area that we had been looking at so even though the site boundary has now been refined to a smaller site, we were looking at a general area and that the site characteristics are pretty similar over the whole area. So, like I keep stressing it was a very blunt instrument to rule out sites, not to choose sites. It was to say ok what's worth keeping, what's worth our while keep looking at and keep pursuing with the community because these are the sites, we might as well drop them now and stop wasting time on them. So O'Connor Hill may yet drop out again, it's not yet time to drop it out, I believe.

No other questions?

PARTICIPANT: With the O'Connor Hill issue, I think we might just get Robert to talk a bit about ... [inaudible]

Robert: I have been attending the advisory group, more as a means to communicate progress of the project and also to give information to the advisory group where they ask things that are not certain of and I don't have a role to influence the decision of the group but I was only trying to provide a link between the Water Corp and the community but on the more ongoing basis. So on the 2nd of April 2007, I attended an advisory group meeting and it was a decision of the group members that they decided that the location of the O'Connor site be reviewed. And it was also agreed or I suggested at a subgroup from that advisory group need to resolve its location and I'm quite happy to take them out and bring along Meghan Diley to help do a survey one day. So that was agreed to be done on the 11th of April and at that time the group, there were six members of the group, agreed to going out on a site visit.

Subsequently, two other members of the community phoned up and said that both of them like to come on to this site visit. So we are happy to accommodate and with me and Meghan there's ten of us in a group looking at this O'Connor site. So we met about 10 o'clock at that the Learning Centre and when we arrive we actually spent

some time at the Learning Centre. And I thought that to gather focus on what we are trying to do, I set up a list of objectives for what they are trying to do. I asked them what they really wanted to do.

And it was agreed that those objectives be to locate or to find an approximate location for treatment plant at O'Connor site and also whilst we were looking at the site to locate a site as far away from a residential area and also to check for impact on heritage. So also while we were at the Learning Centre, I thought that maybe we should also plan the area that we want to visit because it was quite a fuzzy area. There's about 150 hectares of the O'Connor area so we decided that it's best to plan the area that we wanted to visit and we roughly sketched two areas; the Western side which is next to the pipeline and North of Firewood Road so I call that the western side. And then there's, our suggestion for another area to be looked at which is a bit further east of Firewood, further down east along Firewood Road and also we highlighted that it was the area that we would be looking at. So two areas that we agree we'll go and have a look so we drove in three separate cars and we went through the DEC site and had a brief look and stop by and we came along the track and drove up to the junction of Firewood Road and then from there we drove a bit eastward and then we went into the track of the western side. So we had a good look at it and then we came back again and go and look at the eastern side.

So what we have found, it was agreed that the eastern side was not as good as the western side for reasons of costs and also the vegetation was much better than the area on the western side. So we agreed that this site, which was the western site, was the one that we will use for the four sites that we are going to look at in detail.

So after we agreed, we went back to the Learning Centre and when we discuss further and confirm that it was a site that we will move on to privately get more details, information on the O'Connor site. So that's the end of the site visit.

Colin: Can I suggest we take any questions to Robert about the O'Connor site, either in terms of the way that the boundary definition occurred or any issues around that site. You may recall that for those of you who don't recall, the O'Connor site was introduced quite late into the process. It was introduced in a sense in response to the

Water Corporation's suggestion that if there were sites the community or members of the community thought worthy of consideration that they could present those that occurred. However, the assessment of the site that occurred in November, it was clear that people felt they didn't have enough information and one of the questions that was unclear was 'what is the boundary of the site?' And so that was this question that was clarified through Robert working with a smaller number of people, remembering that the issue now is that there's a site boundary revised and then you will have access to the more detailed information that the Corporation will gather on the O'Connor site for consideration with the other three sites.

So any questions for Robert? The gentleman just here. Steve can we just grab...

PARTICIPANT: Firstly, what amount of land do you need for this water treatment plant? How big a piece?

Robert: We need 20 hectares and this is bigger than 20 hectares. I think it's about 35.

PARTICIPANT: Why are we going to 35 when we only need 20?

Robert: Yes we can go down to a smaller size. In fact, even though we show a boundary as such, it's likely that most of the site will not be used to put the treatment plant. There will be lots of area that will still be under vegetation.

PARTICIPANT: Well, doesn't seem any point in making it so big if that's the case.

Robert: Yeah, I agree but it was the decision of the group that it be based on those boundaries. In fact, they wanted to go bigger and I did not see any reason to go bigger, because there was some suggestion to go into the national park which up here rather than using the state forest and I disagree with.

PARTICIPANT: Is there any plan yet for what the water treatment plant will look like? In other words, what shape would that be? How would that fit on the site?

Robert: Yes, we are currently working on that because once we get the conditions of the vegetation there, what we intend to do is to try and put the layout of the treatment plan on that site and determine what impact it would have on the vegetation.

Suzanne: It gives us the more flexibility to optimise the location of the plant on the site to minimise the impacts. So if a site has a bigger cadastral boundary that means that we can choose stuff around it to try and lessen the amount of vegetation we might clear, if that was the site we ended up with. So we'd still only need 20 hectares.

PARTICIPANT: Robert just wanted to have you confirm two things, if you can. Firstly, one confirm that the boundary corner of the boundaries is approximately 50 metres from somebody's property. And the second is that the unusual agreement that you have is that it technically has no boundary and that you are leaving it up to Water Corporation to decide where they want to put the treatment plant in that 35 hectares.

Robert: In answer to your first question, you're asking if whether there's any error there's less than 50 metres away from boundary. Yes there is a property here that is very close to the boundary. And your second question can you repeat that.

[inaudible]

Robert: But that was the reason that we decided to know confirm on that boundary and we will evaluate on the basis of those revised boundaries.

Suzanne: And obviously optimising for minimising vegetation clearing but also distance from houses and property so that we have an adequate clawing buffer that is a really important criteria both for the community and the Water Corporation to get our licence. We wouldn't get a hazardous good licence if we didn't have the adequate buffer. So it is going to be a concern to us that we don't violate any of those criteria.

PARTICIPANT: Just for the site, it's 40 hectares and then for the reservoir where all the water goes is another 20. Is that?

Robert: No the site itself, I don't know exactly the area. I think it's roughly about 35 hectares.
What we need is 20 hectares.

Colin: Basically if I can answer that one, historically back we were talking about having a site of about 20 hectares, which was just over 40 acres. However, of that, we were looking at certain sites that it would have been in the 13 to 15 hectares of that 20 hectares actually cleared for the plant and that's still in the same order. There's no change.

Remembering that this work is to define the boundary, so that both the Water Corporation and this group can do a more detailed consideration of these four sites.

BETH: I have problems with bringing the O'Connor site so late in the process and also looking at these pictures that we've been given, it looks as though there would be a lot of clearing on the O'Connor site and yet on the sustainability assessment, it shows less clearing on the O'Connor site than both sites 4 & 3. And yet they both look like almost totally cleared sites. So I think there's something wrong with this data...

Colin: Robert did you want to respond to that one?

(tape 2 side A)

Suzanne: I mean the reason the O'Connor Hill doesn't do too badly on the clearing criteria, although it doesn't do that well, it's still rated at two is that it doesn't involve any clearing in national park and some of the other sites did for access roads and the likes. So, you know, we need to go back to the details of what clearing, it's not just clearing for the footprint of the site, it's the clearing for the site plus the pipelines to the site from the reservoir plus access roads. So it was a total impact of clearing and

what type of clearing that needed to be done as well, not just any sort of clearing of vegetation. It was what the land if it was a national park that rated a lot worse, so I'm happy to go through in more detail perhaps back at the office when we've got all of the ratings in front of us rather than just looking at the map. Would anyone be interested in this sort of more detailed level?

Colin: I mean the other issue to comment on that one is that it's certainly the Water Corp could not remove O'Connor site because it was one of the sites that was proposed for further assessment at the November forum so I guess even though people made it clear they didn't have adequate information, I guess it was important to continue the process of trying to put that information together and that hasn't been completed yet. Any other questions specifically about O'Connor?

Ken: Robert, could you point to where the residential areas are in relation to the proposed sites?

Robert: [inaudible] To the site and there's another property here as well, so there are three properties that are quite close to O'Connor site.

Colin: Thank you. Were there, I know there are some residents here who, did anyone else want to comment on that question? Residents near O'Connor. Ok. Any other questions around O'Connor, remembering that there will be, the Corporation is putting more information together and will talk a little bit more about this in the next part of session. Ok. It's about... do you want to take a five minute break, then we'll come back and push on with the 'what happens now' so we'll take, what is it about 22 by me so if we take five or six minutes and there's plenty of food here so feel free to help yourself.

[People chattering during break]

Colin: Ok just in this part of this session, what we are going to do is Robert's going to talk to the proposed timeframe for what takes place from here and to sketch out a time plan, a timeframe. Then Jenny Pope who is a senior consultant with JHD who have

been contracted by the Water Corp to assist the Water Corp with its more detailed multi-criteria analysis which Jenny will talk about and she'll talk about that and then Ken is just going to put in some context. I guess the arrangements and processes within the Water Corporation particularly in terms of some of the decision-making processes further down the train. So there'll be basically Robert, then Jenny, then Ken and we'll take questions as we go. The one thing just for me to mention for those of you who know and some wouldn't that there has been an advisory group that essentially advises, has been advising me particularly the organisation and the structure of these forums. That group comprises at the moment there's about 30 people who've registered, not everybody attends. I think we had 16 last meeting and about 24 before that, many of whom are here. In fact as I said, it was that group that requested or suggested that this meeting take place. That group essentially tries to meet, or I try to meet with it monthly and there is meeting of that group planned in June. So some of the ongoing processes are discussed at that advisory group and that group will continue to advise me about this process of site selection process which is part of the responsibility I have. And I am happy to talk about that with people individually. What I'll do is ask Robert. Robert is going to walk you through the proposed process and timeframe of tasks from here. So Robert will walk you through that, you've also got it as a hardcopy on your chair. So if you haven't got that you might want to locate it. So does anyone not have one of those? And Robert will walk through it on the screen.

Robert: I can. What I'll do, I'll go through not in full detail because I know it's very difficult to read but there's a hard copy on everybody's chair. So, if you haven't got it make sure that, I think there are some spares in the front. There are some spare copies in the front here, you can get a full set.

Ok for those who haven't got one, I think you have to share with your, the one sitting next to you. Now that we got four sites, our aim again is to try and get a number of things ready for the next stages of the process. What I've got here is very simple. We are going to get the information and we will also consult with other agencies and we will provide information to the community. There are a number of ways that we can do that and we will also do our sustainable analysis and then when all of them are done, we can make decisions and prepare reports on the preferred sites. In terms of gathering information, we are engaging a number of consultants to do this

analysis, re-assessments and also to do the environmental surveys of outstanding sites and also we do Aboriginal heritage surveys. And then when all the information is available, we try and summarise them and collate them and mail out information to all of you. And we've done sustainability assessment; we've conducted the data analysis on the November forum where you assess all 11 sites. In terms of consultations with other agencies, we've consulted with EPA and also DOW [chattering from crowd] and the Environmental Protection and the Department of Water. Those are the two agencies that so far we've consulted and we are making plans to meet with them over the next few weeks. And we target to finish that by end of May so that by that time more surveyor information available but even when the information is available what we intend to do to provide those information to the community is via three different methods. We will conduct site visits with you guys if you are interested and we will also mail out the information to the members and there will be a late June forum where we'll also provide additional information to the community. So there're a number of ways we can do that but of course we are open to suggestions for the other ways we haven't thought of.

In terms of the re-assessment, we did some preliminary re-assessment and we found that for most of the three sites, the O'Connor Hill, the O'Connor site, DEC and pine plantation locating chlorine storage is not so much of a problem. But at site 1, we do have an issue. I'll explain what we got here. Currently, previous the location of the chlorine storage, which was next to the pumping station, but we have since relocated them to this site here and it was because it's so close to the public area, the museum that it was highlighted and we had no choice but to try and move it temporarily to this location. But we also committed that this location is a temporary location and that we would move it to a place at other sites if we chose even to build a treatment plant here.

So there is a public risk issue at site 1 and site 1 will only become viable if the chlorine storage is located elsewhere. What we thought of is that we can put the treatment plant at site 1 but we have to locate the disinfection facilities at other sites. And they've chosen to put it at either CALM DEC land, the pine plantation or the O'Connor. And currently these concepts are being developed and we will do additional costing to determine how much that would cost for this site. Basically it's still site 1 but with the options of locating the chlorine storage at different locations.

[inaudible]

There is a current study being done in this, in some radius that we used to determine the influence or the hazards to residential area and to any public area. We are currently trying to map those and we will provide some additional information to you either during the site visits and we will get some experts from the Water Corp or from the consultant and we'll talk to you. It might be better to actually have during a site visit so that we can visit the chlorine storage that we currently have below the weir.

[inaudible]

So I can't provide you with the details now because currently the consultant hasn't quite finished the study. Ok in terms of environmental surveys, we did spring surveys for site 1, the DEC land and the pine plantation and the reports are available.

Meghan? We also did a preliminary survey for the O'Connor site and we did that after the site visit that we did with the community members because after they left, we spent another couple of hours walking around the site and mapping some of the vegetation and we have some of the information that you can...

[thump noise]

This information is being consolidated into maps so that when we try and arrange and locate the treatment plant, we can try and position it so that we can least impact on the vegetation. So effectively what we are trying to do is determine an area of impact due to the plant footprint and they are being assessed for all sites. Now what I'll try and quickly go through is these are the results of the vegetation mapping.

You've got various conditions I think, the blue is very good and the stronger the red colour are bad or highly degraded. So if you look at the blue, these are reasonable conditions and then the greens are very good to sort of good to be graded. Right, Meghan?

That's the O'Connor site, as you can see much of this area in the southern part is degraded. There is very good vegetation, near pristine in the northern part of the site. And of course on this site which is outside the boundary, there's pretty good vegetation as well. That's the DEC land. And there's a bit here that is in good condition but there's a bit here that is degraded.

[inaudible]

Yes, Jacoby Park is opposite the DEC land.

[inaudible]

Yes, there is the Kookaburra outdoor cinema is here and the Hills Forest Centre is here. With this site what we could do is to try and locate the chlorine a bit further away from this to reduce the risk of chlorine storage and this is the sort of boundary.

Sorry, I can't hear you.

[inaudible]

And this is the area below the weir and this area is degraded, there's a few under pretty good vegetation. But this site is pretty constraining in terms of area for the treatment plant and also you got a lot of public areas, amenities and in terms of trying to locate the chlorine storage that complies with the licensing, we will not get a chance of getting a licensing here. So we have to locate it elsewhere.

Pine plantation basically over half of the area is under pine and that classifies into three to four degraded but north of area, within that area, is still under reasonable, very good conditions. There's a patch here very good to, which is very good vegetation. I think I should explain this.

I think this just gives you a reasonable update and we are still using that information to try and put a plan footprint to reduce the environmental impact. Ok?

[inaudible]

Colin: That document there and you've got it in front of you, you'll see that the endpoint suggested at this stage and clearly there's a lot of givens along the way but they are suggested the 14th of the 8th 07. Obviously that is an indicative timeframe.

Robert: Yes Colin it is only an approximate timeline and there will be some tasks that are or will influence the timing some of the tasks here. But we aim to finish either August or early September.

Colin: Ok any questions? If we go Sandra and then Ed. Oh Ed's got the microphone, Ed then Sandra.

Ed: Robert can you just explain the bar chart please. Take the blue lines where you are going to consult with certain departments, some of them are long and some are fairly short, what is the significance between the two. Take the Department of Water that's a very short one and the rest are very long. Does it mean that you've already consulted with them and these are somewhere in that timeframe when you have to consult with them?

Robert: Yes, correct. Where you've got a small timeframe that means we've actually met with them, but where we got sort of a very large bar that means it's still within that timeframe to try and meet with them. It really depends on the people that we are talking to when we can meet; how we can get their feedback.

Colin: Sandra, yup.

Sandra: I just want to point out that it seems as though from that and that's a new version from what we've seen previously that providing the information to the

community has become truncated, shortened quite considerably and that's a bit alarming. I certainly feel that putting a late forum on the 28th or the 29th of June which is right in the middle of school holiday period plus it's also end of financial year, there are a lot of people who are tied up with that sort of thing that it's problematic for those reasons. And I would suggest that one more forum is not sufficient for the stage of the process that we are at which was for you to come back to us with that information on those other sites for consideration for the forum meet again. I'd like your comments on that.

Robert: I think the comment about the end of June is quite valid that it's the end of financial year and people will be busy but again as I said it's an approximate timeline and we are quite happy to revise it to try and fit it in with the community's timeframe and see how we can provide adequate information to the community. I think when I attended the last advisory group it was asked that I revise the timeline so that I can give the updates of the information to the members and I've done that but we are quite happy to work something that will give you different ways of getting information or number of steps that you can get to.

Colin: I mean from my point of view I haven't seen that date for the forum so I would certainly be suggesting that it needs to be debated and discussed and negotiated with the advisory group.

Suzanne: Yeah if I could just add to that as well what we've heard loud and clear is that we need to give you guys time to digest the information when we send it out, so sending it out on Friday for a forum on Monday night, we can't do that and we recognise that and I guess as Robert said this is indicative, we hope to have all the info back from our archaeological, ethnographic, botanical, everything else, all those surveys back May-ish, end of May and then as soon as we've got a package we'll send it to you guys and we can work out a date from there.

Colin: Are there any other for Robert?

PARTICIPANT: Robert, I know that Anne Brake from the National Trust, the site below the weir, what is the intention of getting heritage information for all of the sites? Are you just thinking you'll go to the Heritage Council and get something from them or what is the procedure there? Because it's quite a lengthy business and you need a heritage expert to compile that information for you. Because I think the DEC one, we are not aware for instance of how much heritage there will be lost there.

Ken: Obviously, as people have been here for all time, they are aware we've been speaking to most of these people for a long time. It's a formal process that Robert goes through to tick those sort of things off. But as presented in the beginning, the contracts have been let for those currently, I think, they are due in the next two weeks.

PARTICIPANT: I'm talking about ...

Ken: I would have to go to the project people. The answer is yes, it's been well and truly done. Give me a few minutes and I'll come up and give my little presentation and I'll show you where we are in the process at the moment, and who is responsible.

PARTICIPANT: Ok. And just one more thing, perhaps you were asking for suggestion how you can provide information to the community, putting it on display at the library, the Shire that sort of thing.

Ken: Yeah, as Robert was saying, we'll take that on board, all of the issues that you've said he had his plans of getting the information out to the public in three ways, if we can do it better by four or five ways, sure we'll take it on.

Colin: One of the issues that was raised at the advisory group was a concern that this information from these consultations should be available and accessible to the community and the Corporation agreed to do that, so that information would be available to the members of this forum.

PARTICIPANT: Just to clarify that what we asked for was that the copies of the information that was presented to those people be available. So the material that the Corporation provided to those instrumentalities to and for the results or their responses, I think we the community deserve to have both of those.

Colin: Any other questions or comments at this stage? Robert and then Miles, Ken.

[inaudible]

Jenny, can you condense down into a shorter. Sorry to do that to you short notice. Just here and then Miles, and we'll get the gentleman here and we'll need to just move on. So if you can just make your questions or comments relatively brief.

PARTICIPANT: Briefly, is the entire pine plantation in reservoir protection zone or is part of it not?

Robert: Yes, the entire pine plantation is in the reservoir protection zone but we knew that it's a serious flaw but we can engineer that out. We can actually put drainage so that the plan is altered so that the actual pine plantation site is out of the catchment. But it will involve some serious costs because we have to put some additional pipe pumps to take the run off out of the catchment. Sorry I can't hear you.

[inaudible]

Robert: Yeah into what they call the lower Helena catchment.

Colin: Was it Jail, and then it was Miles and then the gentleman just there.

Jail: Two really quick ones, Robert when you showed site 1, you didn't show the vegetation, isn't site 1 in two parts?

Robert: Yes, I was more or less trying to focus on the risk of the chlorine but the sludge bed if it's got to be located we are trying to find a site for the chlorine storage, we'll try and locate that sludge bed on the same site.

Jail: And the other thing was you've done fauna surveys, I guess this is Meghan and Suzanne, are you going to be doing any fauna surveys in those areas as well and overtime. I mean we have things like cockatoos that only breed at certain times of the year. It might be good to start looking for them while you are there.

Meghan: There's been preliminary surveys done but obviously there will be further surveys done as well which take a lot longer, but there has been preliminary surveys done for most of the sites, some of them need further information. For example, the O'Connor site, you know, is obviously a recent suggestion so there hasn't been a lot of work done there and in season in terms of spring. So some of the sites need further work but some has been done.

Jail: But you understand I was talking about fauna.

Meghan: Yes.

Jail: Ok, you just mentioned vegetation only up there.

Meghan: Yes for both, preliminary for both and further work for both needs to be done.

Jail: Thanks.

Colin: Miles and then the gentleman just here.

(tape 2 Side B)

Miles: Just at the end of the last small group meeting, just in the last few minutes it was quite an animated discussion about the education on visitor value of this facility. We can walk over the weir, I'd like to see those agencies included in that list there. What would your comments be on that?

Robert: Do I comment or is it just a statement?

[inaudible]

Suzanne: I could probably say something briefly excuse me for not standing up. I believe when Professor Jeffrey Bolton came and spoke to you, he did talk to you about heritage value not being about dead old things they could be built on with new things. So a new water treatment plant may actually be in keeping with the heritage value of immediately below the weir site? Is that ...?

[inaudible response]

Suzanne: Yeah but that is irrelevant of the site selection really, isn't it? I was talking more about the heritage value and the fact that you can walk through the current weir site and down the hill and have a look at the outside bits of the pumping station, the museum there. So the heritage value can be about connection old and new. But yes the educational value is there, I guess for any of the sites.

Colin: Just last question here and we'll move on to.

PARTICIPANT: Could you just explain to us the legend at the bottom of this presentation, what a rolled up task is, a rolled up milestone and so on because I don't understand.

Robert: I think what I was trying to show you that other than the task in blue, they are not the critical task the one highlighted in red which is really the Aboriginal heritage survey that could be delaying the ... if it does, it also delays the sustainability assessment and all the other subsequent tasks. Really other than the critical task and the normal task that's really what you need to focus on. The other legends are really not relevant.

[inaudible]

Colin: Ok. What I'd suggest we do is we listen to Jenny, if you have a look at this flow chart, the Water Corporation has indicated at this point, so it's a fair way away what is a multi-criteria analysis as part of its sustainability assessment. Jenny Pope is from JHD which is consulting firm who've been contracted to work with the Corporation on that multi-criteria sustainability assessment. So Jenny is going to talk briefly about that.

Jenny Pope: Thanks very much Colin. Just to explain a little bit more about how I fit in and why I've suddenly come on board at this stage of the process. JHD has been involved in this site selection process for a very long time through Meghan who's been looking at the flora and fauna surveys. And I know most of you were looking at Meghan over the last 18 months or so. Meghan is from our ecology group. JHD also has a sustainability group and that's where I sit and so at this stage of the process Water Corporation has employed to guide them through the final stage of the sustainability assessment process so Meghan and I are now working on that together with Water Corporation. Thanks Robert.

So that's basically what the first steps says. So as you are aware, this has been a very long process and all of the site selection has been within a sustainability framework. So we've always been looking at the economic, the social and the environmental implications of the site. So as you've seen from Suzanne what Water Corporation's done in their internal review which was essentially a parallel process to what the community forum did in deciding which site should remain on the table for future consideration and Suzanne showed you how the same four sites basically came out of that process. So this is now the final stage where they are not screening

out sites anymore but instead we are trying to find the best site of what we've got left. And the methodology we are going to use to do this is slightly different. It's got a lot in common with the processes we've used before but it's slightly different; has a term, a name which is called multi-criteria analysis and a lot of you may be familiar with that. And the aim of this final stage of the process is to help Water Corporation get a further degree of detail and a further degree of analysis in order to guide that final decision as to what is the best site for this plant.

So we've already been through a very very comprehensive process and that's all been about screening out. We believe now that we are left with the best four sites, the four sites that the community sees as the most acceptable and also the sites that are most acceptable according to Water Corporation sustainability principals. So here we are sort of going through a mind shift. Instead of screening out potentially bad options at this stage, we are now trying to find the best option. And it's a different way of looking at the process, it means we are building in enhancements as well; the sorts of things we talked about, like education, so this is now about fine tuning these site options as Robert was explaining and working out the best possible layouts. And when we've done that being in a position with all these extra studies and all this extra information that is coming in bit by bit to work out which is the best site and the best site will be the one that makes the biggest overall contribution to sustainability.

So multi-criteria analysis is just a tool, it's not a magic thing that spits out the right answer but it does give you a lot of really valuable information that makes it easier to make that final decision. And its great benefit is that it can handle a lot of different issues and as you know from the work that you've done and from what Water Corporation has done, the site selection process is very complicated and there are lot of different criteria and a lot of different things that have to be considered in choosing the best site. Multi-criteria analysis is basically a way of managing all that information in a structured way and more importantly in a transparent way so that you can actually see what's important in relation to other things and what the results of all these analyses have been and I'll show you a little bit more about how that works. JHD is been doing quite a few of these sustainability assessments using multi-criteria analysis, some on various different projects and we also work with some internationally recognised experts of Murdoch University. They have been

advising us because MCA is kind of a generic term for a lot of different processes, so it's really important that we get the right process for the right situation so we are working with them to make sure that we do get this right.

So multi-criteria analysis has four basic steps and at least three of them will be familiar to you because it's basically what we've been doing all along. The first one is identifying criteria, sustainability criteria in this case against which each option is to be assessed and again you've already done a process like that. You've already established a set of criteria as have Water Corporation. So there's nothing new there.

The second step is to assess the impacts and that means scoring how well each of those different sites performs against those criteria so if you have a criterion of biodiversity which is one of the criterion that we'll be using, we then rank each site according to how well it does biodiversity and in this case you are ranking them against each other so a little bit different from what Water Corporation did before.

And the third step is where, which might be a little bit different from what's been done before, especially in the Water Corp example that Suzanne talked about, she mentioned that there wasn't any weighting. In other words, each one of the criteria was given the same level of importance. In multi-criteria analysis that's not the case and we actually have an opportunity to get groups of people together to say well we got 10 different criteria here, some are social, some are environmental, some are economic and we have to decide which is more important. Is biodiversity more important than chlorine risk? Maybe not, maybe it is to some people and the important thing is that everybody will have a different take on this. And that's really the important part about multi-criteria analysis because what we can then do is we combine these importance rankings that different people might give to various criteria against the performance of each criteria in terms of the information that we have and we can put them together using a mathematical, usually a spreadsheet and that gives you some information which helps to basically rank the four sites. It's really effectively six different options in this case because as Robert explain we got site 1 A, B, and C configurations now. So we actually got six different things to look at.

So identifying criteria, we ran a workshop with Water Corporation last Tuesday to start working on the criteria and we did come up with a draft set. Basically, a distillation I guess of the criteria that have been used by the community and the Water Corporation before. So everything that has been considered before is in the new criteria; just group them a little bit differently and we are just working to refine those criteria now. There's about ten of them and the main inputs to that process were again, we went back to the Water Corporation sustainability principles, we looked and we made sure that all of the criteria that the community used before in your previous process were included. The process requirements of multi-criteria analysis themselves give us some hints about the kind of criteria we should use and the most important thing there is that we don't double count so we made sure that the criteria are as mutually exclusive as we can get them. And just by talking through the characteristics of those four sites gives us some clues about what's going to be important. Like obviously chlorine risk, and biodiversity, and heritage values are in the criteria list because they are relevant to many of the sites.

So the second step of assessing impacts, this is really what's sometime called scoring in a multi-criteria analysis approach and effectively it means gathering all the information which as you know is still coming in. We still haven't got the complete set of information and in order to allow us to cite for each site and each criteria and how well that performs. So really what we are talking about is a refinement of what Water Corporation has done before. The information that Suzanne showed you with the circle was effectively a very rough process of doing that. When we get the more detailed information, we'll do in a more robust and more sophisticated way but it's essentially the same thing.

It's very important that this step of the process is done by the relevant experts, who the relevant experts are will depend. Meghan will be our relevant expert on all things ecological because that's her background so Meghan is in a very good position to say that this site performs better than this site in terms of biodiversity values for example. Obviously heritage specialists, both indigenous and European will represent you to do the scoring or the impact assessment for heritage values.

In terms of some of the community values, there is an opportunity for the community to be involved in scoring things like community amenity for example. That means the

visual impact, the noise impact, the disruption impact; those sorts of things. And in that case, the community, we believe, is the expert body in that case, it's best in the position to do that scoring process.

Step three is important, it's weighting as it's sometimes called and that's about deciding how important each criterion is in relation to each other criterion and that really varies a lot depending on different people's attitudes, different people's perspectives. So we are proposing to do is to run a workshop within Water Corporation to get their perspective but also with the community and depending on how soon the information comes in and how we do this, our ideal scenario would be to run this in the next community forum in June. So we would actually go through a process of essentially presenting the same information again but in a lot more detail showing you the methodology and helping you to go through a process of deciding of those criteria that we come up with, how important each one is in relation to each other one. So it's not a simple ranking of 1 to 10 for example, but actually saying no I think this one is five times more important as this one. So that will be really important information and an important way the community can contribute to Water Corporation's process.

Then there's a whole lot of things you can do with the data. We can average the community's results and average Water Corporation's results. We can run sensitivity analysis and all of that makes it very transparent as to why some sites come out differently in the ranking. And we can say, well if we just change this one a little bit, if somebody had voted a little bit differently over here what impact would that have had on the overall ranking. It helps us to get a really good idea and understanding of why the rankings come out the way they do, which is essentially this analysis step. What we are proposing to do is to program the analysis into that computer spreadsheet and if you'd like us to we can actually bring that along and then input your results straight into the computer so you'll be able to actually see how your results impact the ranking process.

It's then very important that we can use the community's ranking results, the weighting results to compare those to what happened when we did the same process with the Water Corporation personnel and just see where the differences are and use the spreadsheet to see why the ranking might be different. So it really

helps to highlight any reasons for any differences and discrepancies and different points of view.

So this has been a very very brief overview of multi-criteria analysis just to give you some idea. At the next forum we'll go in much more detail and explain exactly how these different steps take place. But essentially what happens next is the Water Corporation continues to gather the data with respect to all of those criteria to enable us to do that scoring in impact assessment process. That part will be done by Water Corporation and JHD in consultation with the relevant experts. We'll also conduct an in-house process of deciding of ranking weighting the criteria, run a workshop with the community and conduct the data analysis. Once the data analysis is all in, JHD will then prepare a report for Water Corporation explaining the results of the analysis and doing different runs and showing how the numbers all come out. And that will be presented to Water Corporation and Water Corporation will use that information to help them make their final decision. It doesn't spit out a magic answer at the end, but it gives a lot more information than we have at the moment to guide them in making that decision. That's all I have to say but happy to take questions.

Colin: Thank you Jenny. I'm also aware of time and we've gone five minutes over. We got a little bit from Ken, if people have to go maybe go. If you are happy, if we push on let's say for another 10 minutes and take any questions and then we'll hear from Ken. Max, yeah...

Max: Yeah, I have a question of JHD. With the four sites that have been mentioned today, three of them are clearly big enough to take the entire footprint, which is the plant and the drying beds. The plan that I had seen sometime ago showed the drying beds were about 5 hectares or 25 per cent of the total cleared area required for the site. It's clear also that the site below the weir which is one of the four sites isn't big enough for both the plant and the drying beds, so they've got to go somewhere else. That means 25 per cent or roughly give or take a little of cleared land has to be somewhere else than below the weir at site 1. That hasn't been talked about at any of the presentations today but for the first time tonight Robert's raised the possibility of the chlorine plant being somewhere else rather than in the small area below the weir. So I'm assuming they'll also look for where these 5 hectares of cleared land and

drying beds are going to be because they can't be below the weir, it isn't big enough, the site isn't big enough. So I'm assuming Robert that they are going to be or JHD are going to look at that being in one of the other three sites because I'd hate to see them come up with a site in the forest over in Kalamunda where it was originally planned and suddenly we've had several rounds of discussion and 25 per cent of the cleared land is somewhere we haven't looked at. So if it is going to be in one of the other three sites, I hope when you come back you do point out where the drying beds, these 10 acres or 5 hectares of land is going to be for site 1 to be considered.

Colin: Do you want to respond to that one quickly.

Robert: Site 1 definitely, originally we intend to put the sludge bed in an area on the pine plantation in the Shire of Kalamunda but now that this concept highlights the public risk due to chlorine storage, we had to find a place other than site 1 to locate the disinfection facilities. That means that if we do put those chlorine storage there, obviously locate the sludge bed in that same site that we put the chlorine storage so that we do not have to have the sludge bed that is currently in conceptualise as in Kalamunda. It will be definitely chlorine storage plus sludge bed and then the treatment plant below the weir.

[inaudible]

Robert: Yes, but if you now think about the impact of the chlorine storage, we need a different site therefore it will seem logical to try and locate the sludge bed in that same place rather than having three different sites to manage.

Colin: Are there any other questions just of the JHD presentation.

Suzanne: The site that we would look at to put the chlorination facility and the sludge drying beds would be one of these sites we are already looking at. We wouldn't be looking at a brand new site that hasn't already been considered by the community.

[inaudible]

Suzanne: It's 1A, 1B, and 1C. Yes three sites.

Colin: Just very quickly, is there anyone that hasn't had an opportunity to ask a question. I'm just aware that the people with their hands up have all asked a question. Anyone who hasn't asked? So just very quickly if you can be brief. We got one here, quick one and a quick one and then I want to hand to Ken and try and wind it up.

PARTICIPANT: Just briefly, when JHD did the final analysis will the community input that we've been doing, will it end up with equal rating with the Water Corp personnel input or will they just override everything we've done in five minutes at the end.

Jenny: The JHD analysis will present a whole lot of different scenarios. It will present the community scenario, the Water Corp's scenario, what happens if you average everybody together, what happens if... we do a sensitivity analysis say if we could change this aspect of the site. So JHD won't be presenting an answer to Water Corporation, it'll just be presenting a lot more refined information which will include the community's results and the results we get by using the Water Corporation weighting figures and then it'll be up to Water Corporation to take that information. Also taking the information from the community ranking process and putting that all together in a package which will then be given Water Corporation Executive to make a decision. So nothing will be hidden.

Colin: Can you just get the microphone Suzanne so we can hear?

Suzanne: The JHD multi-criteria analysis is about the Water Corporation's decision-making process. The community forum process that we are running here tonight as well, you guys will also have a chance to have a ranking and a voting, possibly at the next forum depending on if we got enough information. So there's really to parallel processes happening. It's an important distinction. There are two things you can do for us at the next forum. One is to input to our MCA at the community amenity and

those types of criteria and the second one is to have you own ranking and your own voting for the four sites.

Colin: I think that's a very important point Suzanne's raised that we are talking about. What Jenny was talking about is in a sense a parallel process to the opportunity for the community to do that. That's right.

[inaudible]

Ken: And as usual Suzanne has stolen my thunder.

Colin: Just quickly there were a couple of people that had hands up. If they are short and sharp you can...well got to the gentleman here and then out in the back.

PARTICIPANT: By the way it sounds, you are going to move a chlorine plant now because of the public facilities. Two of your sites that you've picked have still got public facilities around them.

Colin: It is two sites that the Water Corporation has picked, it is two sites that were identified for further assessment by this forum.

Ken: I think as I said we'll take you through the process we've gone through so far. One of the givens here was that there will be a treatment plant in the area because it's needed. The forum has done a tremendous amount of work to help us in getting the best site. So I'll run you through that as long as you like.

PARTICIPANT: But you are moving one site from a public area and it could end up in another public area.

Ken: Sorry what did you say.

PARTICIPANT: I said you are moving a site because of the danger of the public area and it could end up still in a public area.

Ken: No, again we are getting a little confused about the temporary facilities which are there for urgent chlorine and ammonia rejection to a proper treatment plant, which is required for the treatment of the water in the future. Yes.

Colin: Just quickly down the back, the gentleman there. And then we'll hand to Ken just to finish up.

PARTICIPANT: Mine is on the chemicals as well that's existing already on site that you've used down in Mundaring Weir, is there new health and safety laws that have come in that say it has to be moved?

Ken: I think Robert's covered that. We got a license here at the present moment for the temporary facility. We've been negotiating with DOCEP for many years now about when we are going to get rid of it from there. We keep pushing back and saying as soon as we get a site and build a treatment plant we'll be able to move that from there and until we do that, it's a health issue with the water that we keep treating with chlorine at that site. One of the issues which could happen is that if DOCEP, Department of Consumer and Employment Protection, simply say you've got to close the plant down, then we'll say to them, I'm sorry but we can't close it down and still supply water safely to Mundaring all the way through to Kalgoorlie so the option then would be that all visitors be excluded from that area.

PARTICIPANT: The original plant, the one that you showed on site that had to be upgraded and relocated that was never supposed to be there?

Ken: That's been done for quite a long time, I think in 2004.

PARTICIPANT: Yeah but where it was originally, it wasn't allowed there right.

Ken: That's right.

PARTICIPANT: From the new law that's come in or...

Ken: It was right next to the museum and everything, so to keep the museum going we got a temporary permit to move it over to where it is now but that was on a temporary permit on a risk basis and we have to move it as soon as we can.

PARTICIPANT: And it was still a risk when it was in the original place. Is that right?

Ken: It's always a risk but it depends on the risk analysis of where it should be.

Colin: I'm just aware of time; I don't want to go over. Ken is just going to talk very quickly about two things. One is what is Water Corp's process post that timeline that Robert had and also just to explain the changes in terms of the project management structures within Water Corp.

Ken: As usual, I'll go around the opposite way. All of you have seen this slide up and if you flip the next one up, the next one as well please. You've seen those two so I'll be just talking to those two at the present moment. So if you go back to the first one Robert. We've been involved up until now realistically it has been in that area there and the community people have come up with a ranking of sites and reasons. Now basically that was by eliminating all but four. Where we are at the present moment so that was very much me driving that one. Where we are now and the Water Corporation's project planning team is working in that area there which comes under Robert. So obviously for the last six months or so, I've stepped back a little bit and Robert's been the person along with all the experts to start moving through there. But in parallel with that, we've got the transparency of our process and that's what this meeting is about, that's what various other meetings are about. So as people were saying tonight through the multi-criteria analysis the Water Corp under their act and everything else has to go through this process but at the same time all that information is coming back to the community. At the next forum, what's been proposed is that there will be vote, available to you people as well with all the

information that JHD have got will be supplied to you people so that you can run a parallel process continuing down that way and also the Water Corp going down that way. So that's what's planned for next week, sorry next meeting but ... so the issues I guess is that where you see me is most probably driving that part, where you see Robert and the team is driving that bit, and I'll be following down to ensure that it's done. Robert will be supplying all of the information in there.

Once after, I'm assuming after the next forum, we are, the JHD and Water Corp down their analysis, they will have a fairly good idea what the recommendation will be from their point of view. Hopefully, you people will have exactly the same issues here of ranks one, two, three, four, or however you want to go. At that stage, we'll get together, then I come in at the recommendation with the Water Corporation and I will take the input from you people which Colin will be helping put together on that one and the input from the JHD through to Robert on the planning phase and I'll be taking that recommendation to our executive. At the same time, we'll obviously be talking to government as well. If it comes out to be the same site, you beauty, eureka let's go ahead. If there is any discrepancy between going through that process there and that process there, the Executive has got to make that decision of which way to go forward. Obviously the Minister will be involved in that, specifically if you look through the arrows it is a Water Corporation recommendation through the Executive, to the Minister to come up with the preferred site. The Water Corporation is a proponent. If it differs from the community one, then there another two chances for the community get involved. Robert please.

We complete the remaining engineering and other studies based on the endorsed site and then there are two more hurdles that we've got to go through as a Corporation. We've got to do an internal process which is called our *preliminaries to works* process. We've also have got to refer to the EPA. Both of those times and they can be running in parallel, the community under the preliminaries of works can comment or lodge an objection. So even if we come, both of us come out with the same site and we go ahead with that same site, you can still have another go at it. So for example, if 80 per cent of you people agree with us and 20 per cent don't that 20 per cent still has another opportunity to comment or object. And the Minister has to make a determination on that. That's the Minister for Water Supply on that one. Referral to the EPA, you can only object 'to the level of assessment, i.e. your formal

assessment and informal re-assessment' and also on the condition which the EPA put on the project. So you can comment there.

(end of tape 2 side B)

(tape 3 side A)

Ken: We'll have a project. It's a long winded way to go and I think I just like to thank you for certainly for the time and the effort you've put in here. You still got a fair way to go. Please continue to come along with us.

Colin: Are there any question for Ken at this stage. I mean clearly he's given you a fairly quick run through quite complex process. I think one of the issues that some of you have probably been aware of is the changes of personnel within the Water Corp that Ken's role has somewhat been moved and Robert and Jessica have become more involved. So the roles have changed but are there in question for Ken at this stage and then I'll make some concluding comments.

Karen just there.

Karen: It's not to do with this process but a general question, I wondered since the determination has been made on the O'Connor site, whether the people who live opposite there have been consulted on this and whether they are involved in the process at this stage?

Ken: We've been out and that's what I was saying inviting the gentleman to have a talk. Now we just belated the time to get involved however, it was a community's request to bring the O'Connor site into consideration so yes we started talking to people inviting them to come along and Robert has been out there and spoken to two or three initially, left notes for others. Robert how many did you say? Sorry Steve I mean.

Steve: About a week ago, I spoke with three people and left information about tonight's meeting with two others.

Colin: Any other questions of Ken? And then we'll. Ok.

Just a couple of quick concluding comments, so we are at the point where there's a fair amount of work still to be done and there will be another forum, a date suggested is at the end of June but I think that needs a lot more discussion. That was simply an indicative suggestion by the Corporation. The community advisory group meets and I'm sure there's a number of people here who are part of that and if people are interested you can either talk to me or talk to those people. I would hope that that group has the opportunity at its next meeting to discuss some of these issues we've raised tonight and to discuss the issue of next forum. So there's still quite a bit of work to be done. All the information that's been flagged tonight will be made available to you as the Water Corp have said is dependent upon quite a complex timeframe, with one task needing to feed upon another, so the timeframes are indicative. But it's expected that you will receive before the next forum, a package of information which puts together all the site specific information and information about the plant and the sites that you've got some information of tonight. And certainly of those issues you may wish to raise those issues through the advisory group either through me or you may wish to contact the Water Corp directly. So at this stage we are finished with the expectation that there will be a forum sometime towards the end of June or July depending on the best timeframe and I will take the advice of the advisory group about that.

So thank you very much for your attendance and you will hear about the next forum.

Ken: Thank you very much.

Colin: Ladies and gentlemen, I noticed quite a lot of food left over so if you'd like to help yourself then you can.

[End of forum]

