

The 2nd Deliberative Forum Transcription – 12 June 2006

[Opening of meeting]

Independent Facilitator Colin Penter

Good evening and welcome to this, the second deliberative forum. For those of you who I haven't met or don't know, my name is Colin Penter, and I'm the independent facilitator for tonight's forum.

(Minor administrative details, toilets / tea coffee / food / microphone / facilitator's role)

I just want to record a few apologies:

The Honorable J Radicich MLA, Mike Davies and a number of other people from the Stonebill Progress Association, Neil McLaine, Helen Morton MLC, Helen Simcock, Trish Rawlands, Jenny McCormack, and Jens Jorganson – so those people asked us to record their apologies for this evening.

The purpose of tonight is to provide you with the opportunity to discuss the proposed – and it is important to state that - the *proposed* site selection process that was presented by the Water Corporation at the previous forum.

We will walk through that again briefly tonight, and you also have a copy of that on your table and the facilitators will be discussing with you your concerns, questions or any clarifications about that proposed process.

At the first forum you heard a lot from the Corporation, tonight's forum is providing an opportunity for people to discuss issues of concern to them, and as a result we've structured it around a number of small groups.

Just very quickly, I'll just give you a picture of the proposed outline for this evening's forum...we'll start off with a period of time for you to seek clarification or ask any additional questions of the Water Corporation based on the questions and answers that you received through the post. Those questions and answers were derived from the issues raised at the last forum. The Water Corporation tried to answer them - probably they'll need more information for some of them but what we'd ask is we'll seek some clarification or further questions about that and there will be probably more information that the Corporation will need to provide you. So we'll spend about half an hour on that then there'll be an opportunity, a brief presentation from the Corporation again simply to restate the proposed site selection process – *proposed site selection process* – and we'll discuss that in the small groups.

The point of that discussion is to ascertain whether people are comfortable and willing to move forward with that proposed site selection process and if there are any modifications/changes/clarifications that are required.

We'll then take a break and depending on how far we proceed in the earlier session we want to then provide you with some opportunity and again in the small groups to simply begin to discuss and we're not going to go anywhere near completing it tonight because

people may need further information but to begin the discussion about what criteria might be important in terms of a possible site for a proposed plant. So we're not going to – our job is not to decide those – to apply those – it's simply to begin a discussion about them that will go into future forums. And then you will have on your table a copy of a work book which again I would ask you if you would take the time to complete for me and that what happens with that work book is that it comes back to me, I collate the verbatim maybe with some summary of comments that are the same and then I send that out to you within a couple of weeks of this forum. I should clarify that that is I collate that information it's not collated by the Water Corporation and once it's finalized it's printed by the Corporation and posted out to you.

So the workbook – I'd ask you to work your way through that during the night. There have been a couple a couple of people who, there have been a couple of problems with addresses for receiving mail out from the Corporation. If you haven't received the mail out or there's been a problem with the mail out, could you please see Steve MacKenzie down the front here just to clarify if there are any problems. As I mentioned there are facilitators, independent facilitators, who have no association with the Water Corporation on each table and their job tonight will be to, simply to facilitate discussion.

There are also a number of people here from the Water Corporation who are involved either currently or will be involved down the track and they're sitting along the side there. The other thing I just want to point out is that up to now the planning of these forums has been my responsibility and in doing that I try to take into account the feedback that you gave me from the last forum and so this forum has tried to take on board that feedback and I'll try to continue to seek that feedback from you.

However now that the forums are underway, I'm wanting more direct advice from the participants about future forums. And what I'm asking is for people who are willing to meet with me, and maybe representatives of progress associations and maybe representatives of community groups, they may be individuals who'd be willing to meet with me between this forum and the next forum to advise me about the design of future forums if you are willing or interested in that that would probably involve one two hour meeting where I would come to Mundaring and again, I would be taking your advice about the design of future forums so that the forums serve your needs not just the Corporation's. So if you are willing or interested in doing that you'll see I've asked you to provide me with a name and a contact address in the work book and I will follow up those people and I will inform all the people who have registered who those people are.

What we want to start with tonight is an opportunity to seek clarification or ask any additional questions about the material that was sent out to you by the Water Corporation. I know you may have further questions or clarifications or you want more information from the Corporation about specific matters. So as well as asking that now you may also want to provide that feedback in your workbook. But what we're suggesting is that we'll allocate half an hour and you may want to ask questions of me or to Water Corporation about any of the matters contained in that material that was posted out to you.

Yes Sandra?

Sandra: [inaudible start to question]...and I really find that's quite obscene to put it mildly. Because I asked a question about the chlorine plume and I have asked it in the same terms on two

occasions and the question that was put...the answer and the question that was put in that mail out does not bear any resemblance to what I asked.

Colin: One of the ways I can respond to that is to say that you are correct – that is the case, and that there were some problems, I believe, with the tape of the recording that was made at the last forum as a consequence I've asked the Corporation to ensure that there is an independent recording of tonight's deliberations and that is what the Audio Visual people are here doing independently so that we get an independent taping of the questions and the discussions so the answer to your question Sandra is it's true, it's correct that that was an error that the Corporation made in not adequately taping and transcribing those questions.

Participant: Yep. There was a guy exactly here taking notes of the meeting at the same time so did his notes go missing as well?

Colin: No, I understand that the Corporation as I was informed, and they may clarify this, my understanding was that because of the loss of the tape they sought those notes as a basis for what ended up on the website. I think. Is that the situation?

[Inaudible]

Steve: Gerard's very kindly given us access to the recording he did at the last forum and we are in the process of transcribing that and that will go up on the website as soon as we get it done.

Colin: Sandra do you want to follow that up 'cos, I mean, I share your concerns and that's part of the reason why I've asked for this issue to be clarified.

Sandra: I'm sorry. It has to be corrected on the website. Those questions as asked should be a true record of what was asked at that meeting. I'm sorry – you cannot paraphrase what the Water Corp thinks was asked. It has to be in the actual terminology of the question put and the actual terminology of the answer given, for all of those people from outside who go to that website in good faith and who do not see a true record. Thank you.

[Applause]

Colin: Sandra, I will attempt to ensure that happens.

Jael: So if we are to accept that from the last one was a loss of the transcript what about the questions that were asked at the first one as well? I'm like Sandra, I asked two questions at the first forum and the Water Corp said yep we'll look that up, we'll get back to you on that and it hasn't happened – I asked the same question at the last one and it hasn't happened. What's actually happening here?

[Inaudible response]

Jael: About the logging in the catchment area and the impacts of that on the quality of the water.

[Inaudible response]

Jael: No. I asked it at the first forum and the man there said 'yep – I'll get back to you with that'; I asked it at last one and the person who I addressed it to said 'yes I'll get back to you with that' and It's just one question, one example.

[Inaudible]

Steve: As I said, we're going through Gerard's tape that was provided to us and when we've got the complete transcript on that we'll answer those questions.

Jael: I guess my point is that ok, we'll accept the last one – transcript – but the first one people made an undertaking to get back to people about that and that failed, the second one the transcripts have failed part of the process is that the community is a bit skeptical about getting correct and appropriate and timely information from the Water Corp this isn't helping that process.

Colin: I certainly remember the questions you asked, and as I recall the response was from the Water Corporation person – I can't recall his name... Keith – who was there, who took to answer those questions so they haven't been answered I think it's fair and reasonable that the Corporation provides that information. I mean the issue of the transcript, I guess, has hindered that – but your point is well taken.

John: I accept some of the things that have been said both by you and by the Water Corporation but can I make a suggestion? That you may need to think about having a forum meeting just to answer questions? Because questions are banking up which are unanswered.

Sure there were problems last time, but some questions I asked are not recorded. In other cases, questions, which were not asked, are recorded as having been asked and the answers given are answers which were given by the Corporation both in written and oral form quite a long time ago. In some cases I came to the conclusion that the answers had actually been written before the questions were asked. So it's bordering on the absurd. I first thought it was – well I wont say what I did think it was.

You need to bring the whole process back into the area of or the arena of respectability. It's no secret that there is serious amount of mistrust in the community about either the Corporation's intentions or the way in which it is structuring the forums. And if the Corporation is going to redeem its good name it needs to try harder.

Now can I just mention that the questions that I asked last time around which are extremely important, and I'll remind the people here what they are: I asked what the proven commercial principles were which the Corporation abided by when it made its first site selection, what the proven commercial principles were when it made its second site selection, and what proven commercial principles would apply the next time around. We can't have a ridiculous situation in which different approval commercial principles are invented for each of the sites. We'll never get anywhere. We'll be doing this in ten years time.

Colin: John, just to clarify a couple of things that questions that were answered in the material that was sent out to you were primarily extracted from the questions that were raised in the work book, ok? So they weren't based upon the questions – or they weren't based only upon the questions that were asked in the meeting. They were based primarily upon the questions that people based in the workbook. So that would explain why some of the

questions that were raised in the meeting were not addressed in the workbook. Your question you raised I have continued to ask the question that that needs to be answered.

John: That's right! And the questions were not answered at the last meeting No attempt was made to answer those questions. The Corporation cannot be selective in its replies. It has to be [inaudible] open. I think I've said what I wanted to say, Steve – so you can take it away again.

Colin: So in terms of that specific question you're wanting clarified and answered precisely is the same question you asked about what is the meaning of that terminology

John: [Inaudible]

Lois: I find that your workbook is foul which you're well aware and interesting to find out that the questions have also come from that. I have no problem with observers coming to the meeting and I think ordinary community members shouldn't be classed as observers, they should become part of the forum process.

However, I do have an objection to this workbook being presented when it's anonymous because there are many people in this room, as we are all aware, that moved the water treatment plant to the Hill there are people in this room that were on council either as CEOs or councilors or attached to these groups that have ensured that we got a sewerage plant, a water treatment plant, dense urban development, possible sale of 100 reserves across the shire.

I have no problem with these participating and I see you scattered among the crowd. I want names on every single one of these books so it can be judged who is making the decisions. I don't need to know their names; I just think they have to be identified. If you're an observer, say you're an observer. If you have a financial interest, say you have a financial interest. If you're one of the people that made the decisions to move the water treatment plant from Mundaring Weir to the Hill, state it! If you are one of the people that agree to sell 100 bush reserves across the shire, state it, because I am fed up with coming up against you people over and over and again. I want an open, democratic, robust forum and this workbook is not giving it to me. I want questions answered. So that's where I am at the moment.

Colin: The workbook, I mean the issue of observers, I guess the issue there was that the original registrants – there were 218 people who were registered – the status of observers were those people who might come to one forum for a particular reason. So it was simply that the people who registered were those who were that was the issues that were discussed earlier on issues to discuss they would be registrants and the observers would be those who could come and observe. The only other people who are here are people who are from the Corporation, who have some role in some part of a later process.

Lois: Are people that have been party to the decisions that we're discussing are ordinary participant members?

Colin: They would have registered through that initial registration that people have had to complete the form and get back to me. People who hadn't registered they may well have registered since that initial one went out but observes may be people who have attended on the night and may not have been a previous registrant.

Lois: What about names, addresses and phone numbers coming onto these documents? I think we need to check who is filling them in - I'm not interested in knowing, but I am interested in knowing if people are filling them out more than once. Or if they're not in attendance at this meeting, whether they're filling it in when they're not in attendance at this meeting. I don't trust these people and I think that it's interfering with the democratic process I've been - I've spent since 1990 with a group of people that play very dirty. I don't. I'm open, I'm democratic, and I'm incredibly robust. I want, I don't want to know who's filling these forms in, I want names, addresses and phone numbers so you can check to see that the people actually were at this forum that filled this document in...

Colin: Well the workbook is only available to people that attend the forum...

Lois: Absolutely not. There were hundreds of them last time that could have been picked up. So I think that you need an attendance book you need people to fill it in strictly each week I think that people need to identify themselves on these forms so that there is no skulduggery going on. I just find it foul.

Colin: I mean the issue of confidentiality, I think is...

Lois: There's no confidentiality whatsoever you're the only one seeing it. You can check it against the attendance book and you can check it against the workbook that you have. There's absolutely...in an open, democratic, robust system there is absolutely no reason why these documents shouldn't have name, address, phone number, email and an attendance book signed that you check and if the people are so silly that they cant put their names, address and phone numbers in an attendance book and it doesn't come up with them that workbook's is not included.

Colin: I guess my role is simply to try to facilitate a process so that different opinions and different voices can be heard. It's not my role to decide...

Lois: It's got nothing to do with different voices. I am well aware that there's different voices and I have a very different voice to most people in the room. What I'm asking for is open, democratic, robust consultation, which means that this system is open to abuse. I want names; addresses, phone numbers on these documents you check it off against an attendance...

Colin: Well that's not an appropriate role for an independent facilitator, Lois.

Lois: Well then I don't care. As long as no decision comes off these papers.

Colin: The workbooks are primarily about gathering information, there's not - that's not a decision-making mechanism. I mean any decisions, any issues that come out of that are presented back in the workbook being sent back to people and if there they are any issues that would be presented or discussed in a future forum

Lois: Did I misread Mr Walter's letter where he said that we wouldn't need to look at the websites anymore?

Colin: I don't know. You might want to ask him that.

Lois: Perhaps I'll read it to you because I brought it along...

Colin: I'm just aware of other people just having questions

Participant: [Inaudible]...process is to in fact identify the questions that were asked from the floor.

Colin: Yes

Participant: ...From the questions that are asked in the workbooks?

Colin: That was certainly the intention, prevented by the failure of the taking...

Participant: Well it really didn't come out like that

Colin: No, you're right. It didn't

Participant: And you've got to be a bit more honest and open.

Participant: I had a couple of queries on the question and answers that you sent out. On page 11 the question...

Colin: Can I clarify... that the Corporation sent out. I didn't send it.

Participant: The Corporation. On Page 11 can the water treatment plant be compressed to take up less land? On the last paragraph on that page you said "a study has been carried out to compare mechanical dewatering systems which require the smaller footprint and thus potentially less clearing compared with the sludge drying beds. It says the result of the study recommends the drying beds option be implemented for Mundaring water treatment plant, as it was the most cost effective option with similar environmental impacts to the mechanical options". Well...if it... my question is, is a smaller footprint option not chosen simply because it costs more? Because it is a greater cost to the environment if you make a bigger footprint and have more clearing.

Colin: Is there someone from the Corporation who can answer that question? Susanne?

Suzanne: Without having the answer in front of me... there's some one trying to scabble around for it now...it will have different environment impacts because mechanical drying requires the use of power, of course. So were balancing, trying to add up all the impacts in terms of clearing and power use, it might be apples and oranges trying to compare the two different options but in a net sense it might be less.

Participant 2: You said it was the same environmental impacts but the sludge beds were more cost effective, so what I'm saying is are you taking a cheaper option at the expense of making a bigger footprint and more clearing because it says the environmental impacts of the mechanical and the sludge beds are similar but more cost effective to have the sludge beds.

Suzanne: The answer is no, we wont be taking the cheapest answer in this process we're looking at all the different aspects – so that will be cost, environmental impacts and social impacts...but we need to

Participant 2: It just seemed to be saying that in that paragraph – that it was the most cost effective even though there was similar environmental...and I'm saying the cost to the environment is greater, so it's not more cost effective. The other query was on page 20 "How will the waste issues be resolved" the second paragraph under that question says "by 2040 it's estimated that only 2253 cubic meters or 113 truck loads of the dry residual will be produced per year" – and it's going to go to Red Hill – but you say that it's by 2040, so how many truck loads of the dried residual waste for the 30 plus years before 2030... before 2040...? You see, you've said by 2040 that's how much sludge will go to Red Hill, now is that a lesser amount for the 30 plus years before 2040 – will there be a lot more sludge going to Red Hill? Do you understand what I'm saying? Is it going to be a greater amount until then or a lesser amount? You see you haven't said how much waste how much sludge is going – the alum sludge is going to Red Hill before 2040 you've just said by 2040 there will be 113 truck loads of dried residual will be produced per year, but how much will be produced per year before then for 30 years or more? Do you understand the question?

Colin: Is there someone able...if there's a clarifying issue it may be that the people who are here are not the best people to answer that question. I don't know. I mean, if no one is able to respond to that question tonight are you happy to have that question taken on notice? It's been recorded and an answer provided?

Participant 2: Yes. Tell us how much sludge will go to Red Hill from the start not in 30 plus years time not by 2040 how many truck loads how many truck loads immediately.

Colin: Sure. Ok. Is there someone.. Robert can you just identify yourself and maybe your role? Thank you.

Robert: My name is Robert ...I'm the planner in the infrastructure planning branch I do a lot a of analysis of the technical options and I'll try and answer this question as much as – as well as I can.

It is in this case, what the writer here is trying to say is that by 2040 we expect an ultimate waste that needs to be dried in the sludge drying bed and we think that it will be roughly about 2253 cubic meters of residual that needs to be removed. We assume that this will be the ultimate amount of sludge that needs to be removed but it will be growing from now to the ultimate and the current growth rate is currently about 2% so you can imagine that by 2040 this sludge will be sort of growing to that limit at maximum at worse at 2% from now.

Participant 2: So it will be less?

Robert: It will be less now, but...

Participant 2: By 30 years it will be less and that's what you think it will build up to in 30 years time.

Robert: It will build up to that obviously because of population growth and the number of services we will be providing you'll be growing at about 2%.

Participant 2: Why didn't you just tell how much it will be from the start then, instead of projecting at 30 years

Robert: We could have rephrased the wording in a better word scenario

Participant 2: Well if you could just tell us now – in 30 year time anything could happen there could be new technologies – whatever.

Robert: It could be that but the amount of sludge is still dependant on how much is in the raw water so it s not going to be changed dramatically...

Participant 2: Just let us know in real time. Thank you.

Robert: We could provide that answer in the next forum, ok?

Colin: Just a follow up question... the gentleman just here...

Participant: All I want to know, is where is all this sludge coming from?

Robert: Sludge comes from the catchment in terms of all of the sediment which gets washed down when it rains and it sort of some of them are dissolved which we tend to get off using some of the electrolyte alum to put into sub soil colloidal etc but others are mainly sediments that actually get all mixed in the water they sill get transferred to the treatment plant. It's a natural outcome of the characteristics of the run off in the catchment that you get a lot of these.....coming into the catchment. It's not man made it's just the nature of the raw water that we divert from the catchment – take it to the treatment plant – that's what we need to get out.

Colin: There's a question just here.

Participant: Thanks very much. Firstly I'd like to make a bit of a comment I guess, and then ask question which I hope will actually show that my heart is were my words are. First of all I have to tell you that I work for one of the organizations that had the treatment plant moved from the Weir as it has been described.

We actually had concerns at the time that perhaps heritage in Mundaring would suffer there were genuine reasons for that however, I need to tell you – and I hope that everybody feels the same way that everything is back on the table. Site one is being reconsidered again and we are very open to that process. I hope that everybody here is dedicated too. Because every day I take school children around – I don't work for the Water Corporation, I work for the National Trust – and I'm telling them how this water supply saved lives in the Gold Fields, how CY O'Connor has built a reliable and safe water supply and I just hope that everybody is feeling that way too, that that is what we are here for to try and ensure that happens still.

So my questions as I say we are genuinely open to look at things all over again. My question is this firstly, do I understand that site one is now too small – that 25 hectares – that you cant get 25 hectares at site one? Secondly, there's been a bit of, I haven't got it clear yet, do I understand that B station can actually be modified and improved or will there definitely be another one? I mean, can we save money if it goes to site one by modifying B station? Thank you.

Robert: Site one in itself direct below the Weir does not have enough area for treatment it therefore requires another site to put a drying best. As regards to the second question which relates to B station, B station is an all pumping station which is nearing the end of its life and because we need to provide a reliable infrastructure we need to think of replacing it.

It depends on the locating of the treatment plant if its located say 1km below the dam we can actually put the pumping station well away from that heritage area and put it into that new area. But if it's located between the weir and the Sawyers Valley tank that means we might need to replace B pumping station quite close to where it currently resides. So it has got some impact regarding which site you finally select.

Colin: Did you want to clarify any further matter?

Participant: No that's fine, thank you.

Colin: Sandra just down the back there. Thank you.

Sandra: I thank the person concerned who's put their hand up and said that they were part of that decision. Um, I would also like to point out to people here present that the current site, website, the Australian heritage commission which does the listings of the nation state has on its website the proponents, description of what Mundaring Weir included as part of them nominating it and them accepting it as an indicative place. And is that a water treatment plant that the water treatment plant is going to be built there! So I recommend to every body concerned that they go into the Australian heritage site, look at the Register of the National Estate and read that paragraph because it states categorically that the proponent was registering it on the basis that there was going to be a new water treatment facility there.

Colin: I'm just wary of time and I'm willing to take one or two more questions – yep, the gentleman just here – and then John and Jala. Just get people who haven't asked a question.

Participant: I was one of those people who raised the question is the plant really necessary. I raised it on the grounds that why don't they put more chlorine stations currently I find that there are four injections of chlorine between the dam and Kalgoorlie. Why wasn't additional chlorine stations put along the way – why wasn't that the first evaluation? I did read in there where they've just wiped it off but there was no reasoning behind saying it wouldn't be done.

Colin: So would you like clarification of why that's not possible?

Participant: I would, please.

Colin: Can someone pick that up? Robert?

Robert: The chlorine is a disinfectant that we use to treat the water and we do have disinfectant stations all the way up to the goldfields not just at the Mundaring treatment plant and we also add ammonia to introduce a different type of disinfectant that lasts longer than just chlorine, Now the issue of disinfectants is not just put in the chlorine its also about the nature of the water because of the natural organic matter that is in the water from Mundaring. Basically the natural organic matter just chews up the chlorine so quickly that you have to almost re chlorinate to try and maintain the residue so instead of trying to put too man chorine stations and having some product with disinfection by a product called THM we try and remove the culprit which is the natural organic matter that exists in the natural water, so that the less natural organic matter you have in the water the less number

of time you need to re chlorinate and that's why we need the treatment plant. It's to remove the organic matter in the water.

Participant: [Inaudible]

Robert: We have actually considered putting multiple treatment plants everywhere, including at every town site and the cost is really significantly more expensive than what we have considered. Well in excess of 200 million dollars but the thing is its not just about cost, it's also about environmental impacts and social impacts that we have to consider. Cost is just one of the criteria that we judge which site we should have.

Colin: I think we've got time for I think there were two people who indicated questions and then I think we need to move onto the next part of the evening. John.

John: This is more on the way of a statement first thing I'd like to say I still haven't had an answer to the questions that I've now asked twice, perhaps they will come in writing to me but then I would have to print out copies and distribute them to the people in the forums so its much more satisfactory to say it out loud while everybody's here.

The other thing I'd like to draw attention to is the contents of a circular, which I think is being delivered to most of the corporation's customers. It's dated Autumn 2006. It says that the Corporation, under the leadership of a gentleman called Gath Walter, (must be family business, Ken) it describes 200 million dollars worth of work in new facilities and upgrades for the goldfield and agricultural supply system and I'll now read a short paragraph: "Other work in the goldfields includes a new 17 million dollar project to design and build two reservoirs and water treatment facilities at Bindoolie west of Kalgoorlie boulder".

When Mr Cardee delivered his presentation at the last meeting he provided a lot of what I thought were plausible reasons for not being able to send water up the line to Kalgoorlie – or the Goldfields region and have it treated there. The question is – what does it all mean? The question is that it was explained to us that it was impractical or inappropriate to treat water for the goldfields area at the goldfields but this circular says otherwise. What is the truth?

Colin: Is there someone from the corporation who can respond to John's question? If not it may be a question that needs to be responded to in the material. Is someone able to answer that?

John: Don't you know what your brother's doing Ken?

Robert: I haven't read the materials, so I don't know what's going on.

Suzanne: The 17 million dollar project is two large storage reservoirs to hold water, not treat water. There's no treatment facilities.

Colin: So you're going to repudiate the words in the corporation circular?

[Long pause]

Colin: John, I'm just aware of time. I'm just wondering if we can answer that question on notice?

John: As I suggested earlier, there may even be a case for you having another forum meeting just to answer questions.

Colin: I guess partly what we're trying to do is address those as we go.

Suzanne: I've just had confirmation from someone who has had some involvement. It's just chlorination at that site. It's not water treatment. And adding to what Robert was saying earlier to the other gentleman's question, the kind of treatment we're proposing removes those organic materials. Chlorination itself doesn't remove the organic material. It just disinfects.

Colin: I've just got two just here... we'll do three and then well have to wind it up and move on.

Max: At the last forum there was an indication that privately owned properties would not be further assessed for the water treatment plant. In some of the literature that I've seen since then it was suggested that if the forums decided that a private site was an appropriate site then it would be further considered.

I need clarification of that because I know at the last forum there were a lot of people who owned privately owned land there to be able to voice their view about their land – if their land is now back on the agenda they and their colleagues are not part of this forum because of the assurance they were given that it was not to be considered.

I think someone has to make a very firm statement that is adhered to that the private property is not going to be considered and then they're off the agenda full time – that's one thing that I ask.

The second thing that I ask I don't think people generally in this room fully understand the extent to which the Water Corp delivered water into the agricultural region of our eastern area, and this talk about Mundaring and the Goldfields I think is confusing the real requirement of the Water Corp to deliver quality water to a huge area that extends almost as far south as Narrogin and as far north as Dalwallinu.

So I'm asking the Water Corp at the next forum to produce a map showing the reticulation mains of the water that comes from Mundaring and where it is distributed to just so that every body in this room can see the hundreds of little towns and places throughout Western Australia where the water's going to and this view of just treating water between Mundaring and Kalgoorlie doesn't show the true picture.

Colin: That issue of the private property...Ken do you want to respond to that.

Ken: The issue with private property is like the Weir site, everything is back on the agenda. However, the categorical statements that I've made previously is that the Premier has said that there will no compulsory acquisition of private land for this. If this forum here comes out and says that we've got to go to site 3, 4 or 5 or 7 which is private land to consider it, then I will and negotiate to try and purchase that land. If people aren't interested in selling – that's it. Full stop. So everything is back on the agenda, hopefully at the first workshops – we should be into now – where our proposal is to get down to eleven sites which is serious for consideration there are only very a few private land left in those the vast majority of private land has been taken off the agenda. However, as I said if anyone comes up with a

new site, we will consider it and that does include any new land. So does that answer your question, Max? We will not compulsorily acquire land.

Max: It does answer the question, and that's of great concern your actual answer. Because there are at least 50 odd people at the last meeting who are not here tonight.

Ken: Correct.

Max: Now if you're going to take a vote of focus groups to look at a particular piece of private land, then that's 50 people whose vote isn't going to be counted. Now if they were here they could well have voted that that land not be considered and that could well have been the end result.

Now I think it makes it very difficult to get some true outcomes from the meeting if at each meeting there is a lesser number of people voting on the end result.

So if you want to go back and consider a private property then before you vote on it I think you've got to write out to every private land owner and let them all come to the forum again, and let their combined vote dictate which particular property is going to be considered.

[Applause]

Ken: And I cannot but agree with you. The other one on the presentations that were handed out which were on the website does show the towns and the reticulation mains that are serviced from the water that comes through the Mundaring pump stations and the tanks. So if you go into the website, in the previous presentations you'll see the maps there.

[Inaudible]

Colin: Will that answer that question those people have raised if the Water Corporation put that map together and make it available in the material that goes out for the next forum – for those people without access to a computer? Thank you. We've got two to go. I need to be quick please. Up the back here, the gentleman, and then we'll come down here. Yes.

Rose: In answer to the questions that were just posed a moment ago, it was stated at the last meeting – at the first forum down in Midland that the Water Corporation would not contact the people but if people want to sell and want to approach the Water Corporation they can do, and if the Water Corporation is interested, they will take it further. They themselves will not take a real estate agent – the owner of the property will have to contact a real estate agent and go further. It was stated quite clearly, and it also come has to my ears since then that a couple of people have approached the Water Corporation and apparently want to sell their properties.

Colin: Can you respond to that one, Ken?

Ken: I'm not quite sure – but basically for the Mundaring water there's two processes here, if you like. If we decide – and that's a big "we" decide that a site should be considered for a treatment plant then I will go and talk to the people and see if they want to sell. A separate process, which is in place, is that we have some money put aside to purchase land within the catchment area, so that if you have a block of land within the catchment area and want

to sell, we would be interested in purchasing it to get people, animals and anything else out of the catchment areas. That's a separate issue than me buying land for a treatment plant site, because that treatment plant site doesn't necessarily have to be in the catchment area or in or out of the catchment area.

Rose: It's totally understood, it just that I clarified the question and your answer to the questions just put about the private land and what people can do who have private land and want to sell to the Water Corporation. I just clarified. It was actually all stated quite clearly at the last meeting and this evening at least four questions have been asked that were asked already in the previous forum it was answered in the papers. It is written in black and white if people have taken the time to read through the whole lot and I could not find a problem - with some of the questions answered should not have been questions tonight because the answers are in the papers sent out to you.

Colin: Just here...

Participant: Firstly I'd like to say that I could not agree with Max more I think he represents a lot of people who aren't here tonight. This meeting is in danger of being dominated by narrow focus interest groups and I think that's a big danger in skewing the outcomes of this whole forum particularly by people who perhaps aren't looking for the best design we can get rather than simply to act in some way to interfere with the process and to slow it down and I think we're here tonight as it says there to come up with a site selection process and start to put some criteria together and were getting slowed down by minutia type questions that just don't need to be answered or don't need to be asked, because as that lady said, most of the answers are in the last bit of material that was sent out. So let's move on here. Let's stop wasting time and perhaps we could limit the amount of time that certain people get hold of this microphone. Thank you.

Colin: Thank you. And I take your point. That's one of the difficult balances that I have to try to manage what I don't want to do is choose to censor people, but I do need to manage the time carefully so thank you for raising that and that's an issue that I need to try to manage. What I'd suggest is that we'd end this period of questions and answers and that you will have a chance to ask further questions in the next period there will be opportunities for the Water Corporation people to come and address issues, so this isn't the only chance to ask questions tonight. The work we're going to do now is there's going to be a brief outline of what was *proposed* last forum as a site selection process. And the Water Corporation will talk briefly to that and then the opportunity will be to discuss whether people are comfortable continuing to work with that process as is outlined by the Corporation. In that discussion, that will be a facilitated discussion, if you have questions that you need the Water Corporation to answer, the facilitators will seek someone to come and answer that question, or if it is another question that may be that I need to answer. So questions, you will further opportunities to answer – to ask. How are we going?

[Long pause]

Colin: Steve have you got that slide of the process? What you have on your table and you were basically introduced to last week and we're going to spend a bit more time talking about this in a few minutes, is this proposed site selection process – there are copies or a copy on your table and you would have received this. It is important to state this was presented at the last forum and you'll have a chance to discuss this in a minute within the syndicate groups. What's proposed, if you have a look is that there were 21 potential sites, in the first

forum last week there was some information about those, there was some information about the plant and the Corporation introduced what it called its sustainability framework. What's proposed is that there be some opportunity to then assess and filter those 21 sites down to 11 site options and they were made available to you at the last forum. There were some additional sites that were mentioned at the last forum, and the Corporation will talk briefly about those tonight. So what we need to talk about this evening is how comfortable people feel working through this particular process. The lower options are where we'd plan to get in number five, six forums. We're essentially looking at tonight at the issue of this process and whether people are comfortable about the numbering of 21 sites down to 11. People may not be. And we need to talk about that in the small groups. Ken's going to talk briefly about some of this and a couple of the additional sites flagged at last forum.

Ken: From last forum, we had this up there where we had the initial 21 from our point of view we believe that we can easily get it down to 11 sites and go through the...the GHD based the following criteria that it had to be less than 1km from the Mundaring pipeline, the site area had to be greater than 25 hectares, surrounding land use, residential areas and the sites were not selected if they did not meet the majority of those criteria.

However, again I'll repeat, if the community has concerns with that, then let's hear about it today and this is the first of the workshops which the facilitators will take you through tonight. Right. Grouping of site options, we've put them into three below the Weir, between the Weir and the tanks, and east of Sawyers Valley.

Basically what people were asking what the extra costs were and all those sorts of things if we have the same treatment plan in the same location and I'll speak up loud and I'll work around here [inaudible] What we're talking about there as much as anything is the extra costs as you can see on this one that requires two gegalitres of treated water from the water treatment plan for example at West Northam. This is a West Northam one. If we were to go to West Northam, we'd require all that extra pipeline we'd require take off points which have property treated at Bakers Hill, Wundowie, Wulloloo, Chidlow, Sawyers, so as we said earlier – as Max was saying- we're not just talking about Mundaring and Kalgoorlie it's everything in between for example to take a treatment plant out at West Northam, we're talking about a cost of 301 million dollars.

Another option which comes up there is if the integrated water supply was supplying Mundaring as distinct from coming from the treatment plant, its really doing the same thing we've got to get water to Mundaring so the extra pipelines either way are very similar. So these are the sorts of issues when we get down to the real details this is the sort of stuff which you can all be considering along those costs there.

The Sawyers valley to Bakers Hill supplied with integrated water supply, again as I was saying, we'd need that third pipeline to supply that. A question was asked in the question and answers as to why the third pipeline was required and that's been answered in the question and answers. Other questions which came up, on the feedback that we got from the question people asked have we considered Farrell Grove, Fred Jacobe Pike, anything on cleared land, and land along Great Eastern Highway - the answer is yes to all of those.

If people believe they that should be considered further then I'm sure Robert can come up with some fairly quick answers as to why they couldn't be Farrell Grove, for example, is about two and a half to three kilometers away from the pipeline, so therefore we're up for huge costs. Farrell Grove, for example, is in a basically a pine plantation but also there's

camping areas, but to get to it, there's significant pipeline and movement through the national park, but those answers if people want to get them, Robert will come up. Fred Jacobe Park has similar sorts of problems. Yes it's very close to the pipeline, it's not very big, there are other residences near by and it's also in an area which is well habited. Anything on clear land, well that's effectively what we've looked at right from the very beginning, and that is where I believe that nearly all of the cleared land is in private ownership and in small lots, so we have a problem in getting those done and land along Great Eastern Highway –once we get out of Sawyers Valley area, we're getting too far away from the pipeline for example. So the costs really do start to escalate. They're the questions which I think Colin is going to take you through now, they are basically the reasons why they haven't made the cut according to the Water Corporation, and Colin and the facilitators will be taking you through those I would hope that we could certainly get down to about 11 sites today, but the second phase of it which is very important, which is after the break, would be to start getting towards some of your selection criteria that we can actually apply to those 11 sites. So Colin, can I hand that over to you? What the process is tonight, and I'm sure Colin will go through it, please get involved with your groups and everything else, but if you need any assistance from any of the technical people or anything like that, you've got your flags and things to wave and we'll get them around to come and talk to you.

Colin: Thank you. One of the things we wanted to make sure of tonight is that the presentations and the PowerPoints were kept to a bare minimum. If there are questions that you wish to ask of the Water Corporation about anything that was just raised, the facilitators have a coloured card system, they'll hold it up and someone from the Water Corporation will come and answer those questions. So we have got a mechanism to answer questions, rather than to try and do it in the large group.

Now as Ken just explained what the Corporation has proposed is the that the use of those criteria to narrow down the 21 sites to 11 sites with the possibility of some additional sites is something that we're asking you discuss with the facilitators. So is that proposed site selection process of narrowing 21 down to 11 and then applying the process outlined in that yellow flow chart, how comfortable are people with us moving forward with that proposed process? And are there modifications or changes that would be necessary to accommodate the concerns that you might have?

That's the issue that I would ask to discuss within the syndicate groups, we're going to allocate a period of time of about one hour to this, which is then going to mean we'll see how we go time wise it may be that that length of time is not required. If you have questions of the Corporation there is a process to have someone come and answer those, and what I'd suggest is that you feel free to help yourself to food or a tea or coffee at various stages as well. So if there are questions please take the opportunity to get the people over you need to answer them. Ok thank you.

[Discussion in Syndicate groups]

Colin: ...Specific sites which is not the purpose of this – I'm happy for people to discuss that – but its not part of this work to do that sort of detailed look down at sites. We're really just looking at that broad process, I know some of you have begun to talk about criteria but it's very important that we don't get ahead of ourselves and make assumptions. So can I suggest each group take five more minutes, those who feel they've gone far enough please take a break and in five minutes time we'll just hear some report back.

[Discussion in Syndicate groups]

Colin: ...Have asked me that they either need to go get home or that they are keen to get back to watch some of the World Cup. So what I suggest we do it some of the groups have not really begun to discuss the second issue which was about the criteria – some groups have – I think with limited time, we need to come back to those issues in future forums, so the discussion tonight was exploratory about those criteria. Some groups have done considerable work on that already and the facilitators have recorded that.

Other groups have not had a chance to really discuss that issue of the criteria and what we'll do is come back with those collated in the material that gets sent out for the next forum. What I was going to ask because of the time constraints, again the other thing we need to be careful about is we don't get ahead of ourselves here, I know that some of the groups have really begun to talk about applying the criteria, but that's not where we want to be yet. So we need to be very careful about not getting far ahead of ourselves with that process. That's something we'll do in later forums.

The other issue we need to be careful about is there are still questions and concerns that the Corporation needs to answer and so we need to be careful with that. What I'd ask it perhaps if we could hear a brief summary from each of the groups, specifically not about the criteria but about the issue of the site selection process. What was discussed around the proposed process of 21 sites being narrowed down to 11 and beginning to develop criteria and beginning to apply those criteria in future forums.

Could we start from a very brief report from each group we're not... the purpose is not to make a decision tonight the purpose is to have a discussion. That material will be summarized and discussed again next forum. SO could we perhaps, Amanda could either yourself or one of the group give us a quick summary – maybe I'll ask the facilitators to just do a summary of each groups' broad discussion.

Amanda: Our group were basically pretty happy with the process. Most people at this table felt the process could be narrowed down perhaps a bit faster, even more time on the site selection and substance, less on the process and perhaps we could have gone from one of the yellow boxes "11 site options" straight down to another yellow box in the process to "three or four viable site options" so basically speeding up but there was a minority view at the table that basically that this was good that this process was this way, that there could have been actually maybe a bit longer for the process and not to try and cram it into four forums, each forum could be perhaps about specific things and that we do need time to deliberate as a community an not speed up the process so this is obviously two very divergent view points.

The third and the fourth forums could perhaps be three to four forums instead of two and just some general comments on the process was we need to start on time, people should be reading their materials before the forums and not waste time answering things that have been answered previously.

We need a separate forum just for questions and answers, and perhaps that the questions need to be immediately by Water Corp staff who know the answers.

Perhaps the independent facilitator needs to be stronger and reign people in a little bit – one to two questions need to be one to two more questions and this need not be followed through with.

There were some initial criteria that we came up with things that need to be considered are visual impact, air pollution, and a big one for this table was timber, cost to the environment in terms of clearing – we need to look at clearing in terms of pine plantations, good vs bad bush land bush land being cleared, things that need to be considered hollows for native animals, habitat trees, flora and fauna survey and spring, and building corridors around clearing and running costs.

Participant: We probably didn't get as far as that. We got into quite a lot of detail initially on discussions about the sites about the 11 sites and there was more information requested on the second site that is 1km down from the Weir that was seemed to have come in suddenly without too much explanation.

Some felt that there wasn't enough information to make an informed decision they requested that a table is provided with each site to identify how potential sites that fit the criteria quite comprehensive in one sheet but what criteria and why they fit and what the issues are with each site so that people can look at it at a glance and start to work with what they're looking at.

They also requested a new revised map with just the 11 sites plus any additional ones anyone might have had. We had one additional site which was the site Flynn Grove Farm in Abercorn Road that that be considered because that is owned by the Water Corporation so we did have an additional site to be considered and that we have a new map that is to scale so that people can understand it, that the new sites are on there including the pipeline and the catchment area and they've requested that could they have this before the next forum.

As far as the process went the table went generally 6:2 six thought that they wanted to move along with the process and accept the narrowing down of the 11 sites and start to look at the 11 criteria for narrowing these down further. But two were against that and also wanted to add that they didn't want any sites that were near people. But generally the feeling was that they wanted to move forward with this process. That's as far as we got. We didn't get into looking into this criteria.

Sharon: What was also on that was we also wanted environmental and cultural and social impacts on each site, and also in the paper it stated that different sites would require different types of treatment plants, so we also want those on there because we can't – and that was agreed to – it was – because we can't really make any kind of an informed decision or judgment because we just don't have the information.

Participant: Our group – everybody pretty much agreed with the process and thought that the process was fine there were a few comments that it does take a long time and we do seem to get bogged down in specific issues and so maybe just moving that along quicker would be better.

The biggest issues in regard to going from the 21 sites down to the 11 sites seem to be the issue of the legality of the decision to start with and whether or not it was their requirement to follow prudent commercial principles and it would have been more efficient to settle the

meaning of that at the beginning and at the outset before deciding on a site selection criteria. And the other major issue was about private land owners that there be no compulsory land acquisition and if that's actually been stated, that could have actually been decided before it was even listed by contacting everybody who was actually in the vicinity of an area and did own private land, and if only one of them – if you had to buy five properties and one person said no, then that site could be scrubbed off the list straight away.

They were the main issue that we had with the site, and then we went onto the criteria. Most of the criteria again came down to the private land ownership, that there be minimal clearing of bush land, that consideration be given to already government land first, that the selection criteria gained from here should be applied and the system we're going through should be relied upon to capture opinions from all of the groups so that specific groups didn't have an ability for their opinions to be weighted higher or more greatly than an individual or any other group. We looked at the issue of incumbency the Weir is the current site.

Then we also talked about perhaps applying a rating system to order the criteria as to what was felt to be more important - that issues such as human interest, the aesthetics, heritage, tourism, recreation all be considered and that issues like aesthetics, heritage, tourism and that were felt that they should be lower down the rating scale.

Another option is that we should have conducted a vote in the community first so all of the sites be listed with the for and against and send that out to the community and ask that the community to vote on that right at the beginning, so that would have actually, perhaps even been done before any of this process is needed to be entered into.

And the proximity and site selection should have been given to sites that are already degenerated or covered by non-indigenous vegetation and we were specifically talking about perhaps the pine plantations they've already been mentioned that there's disease issue with some of those and that site selection shouldn't be limited to cost alone.

Participant: I will try and keep it brief according to the instructions of my group. We were generally as a table – people were very happy with the site selection process flow chart. All seven at the table were content with that. There were still some unanswered questions from the earlier forums, particularly what does “prudent commercial principles” actually mean? And is there an overall limit to the budget for the project? We also had a question around the quality of the water in Mundaring as it currently exists, and whether this met international standards and we were informed that it actually didn't, so there is a need to do something.

We started to discuss community criteria and in the middle of that we also looked at the possibility of site visits which was another question a bit further on. All seven people at the table would like to visit other water treatment plants, and also would like to have some discussion with surrounding residents of those plants, if that was possible as well.

I guess that also falls a little bit into the criteria box as well. We would like to see some models of treatment plants on the proposed sites when we get down to three or four sites, rather than all 11 – some people reckon a 3-D model of what that would really look like would help understand the implications of choosing a particular site.

Also to have some idea of the typography of all 11 sites and the state of the land they're on and also be able to view all of the sites that aren't readily visible from the road especially site one – below the dam, and the pine plantation site. So that's where we got to – we hadn't really got much further with that and the criteria.

Participant: The consensus on our table was largely against the process, the participants felt that at this point they couldn't proceed as the information that they required to make a decision had not been provided by the Water Corp.

They also felt the process at this stage that they had been directed into this rather than have any genuine input into the process. They also felt that the process flow chart was a bit pre-empted at this stage. There was a concern that in the beginning, ten forums had been committed to, and we're only in the second or third yet we appear to have ruled out a lot of options and are short-cutting in the process.

A request from our group was also the need for an independent speaker into water treatment to speak to the group. One person was happy with the process was prepared to work with it, providing the information from the Water Corporation was speeded up or provided and that process could be modified as we went.

Some of the criteria that we discussed included heritage values, both historic and non-built, and most importantly was that if private land that was earmarked for a site, that the owner would ultimately have veto over not selling. Environmental issues were also outlined including more specifically a couple of sites, which were identified by the group as being particularly environmentally sensitive including Lake Leschenaultia and Chidlow Farm. So it was a concern there as to the treatment plant and what environmental impacts it would have.

Bab: Our group looked at the whole 21 and compared that with the 11 and at first we weren't sure how to move forward, but what we worked out amongst the group was that the main concern was around private non-government land. And so the group felt that we either need to set a criteria and test it against the whole 21 or we needed to rule out private non-government land.

So we asked some questions of Colin and we also had some questions from some of the Water Corp staff and also the GHD staff and basically we came to a decision that we were going to consider six sites, so there was quite a bit of discussion about whether we were jumping the gun or the whole chicken and egg like do you rule out some sites or do you set the criteria, so, hopefully we got a balance of getting focused on the sites that we thought wouldn't be a complete waste of time.

Because as we discussed with the Water Corp staff was that this agreement that no land would be compulsorily acquired is a real thing and has been stated over and over so that's why we felt that unless a private property owner had already come forth then we ought not to talk about that site.

So that was quite a consensus about the six sites and we felt like we were a little bit naughty and out of the game, but we also took on an additional independent view that no national parks, tourist, heritage or RPZ zone should be considered either and that we should just get down to the sites that were without those. We did find a bit of time to move onto the criteria, but we really only scratched the surface and we were focused on energy

efficiency and visual amenity, so we still do have a lot of work that we'd like to do and lots of individuals have filled in their forms about that.

Max: One of the things that we found difficult as a group in the table to get onto was the criteria for site selection because there was a basic assumption to the criteria that the water treatment plan was absolutely necessary in Mundaring. And so the table spent a good amount of its time trying to determine why the Mundaring area couldn't be treated with water from the Perth scheme and therefore the Mundaring water that goes into the agricultural and goldfields areas is treated somewhere else.

We did have an officer from the Water Corp who came and explained to us a view on that, but why I highlight it is that it was of concern to us that it still wasn't clear enough as to why the water treatment plant was needed. And so that's an issue that we believe the Water Corp must address. The consensus from the table, and it not necessarily an absolute consensus, but the consensus from the table was that Water Corp have a vested interest in saying that the water needs treating, and to convince this group that the water treatment plant is needed in Mundaring at source we believe an independent expert needs to assess that statement, does the water from Mundaring have to be treated in a water treatment plant here or could it be treated further along the line and Mundaring supplied with an independent Perth supply?

Now there are answers to that, but the table wasn't exactly confident in the source of those answers. So I'll just state it again, they believe it should have an independent expert examine the alternatives of locating a water treatment plant either in Mundaring or elsewhere. In terms of that, if that issue was resolved to the tables satisfaction that the water treatment plant must be here, and what was absolutely needed for here, then we could like with the criteria that was outlined except that we would add some important issues to it, and that is that that in environmental issues, we believe biodiversity is an important issue that doesn't appear to be stated, that the cost of environmental loss is not stated and so if balances are being listed that environmental vs economic – it's very easy to cost economic – put a dollar on it we've had hundreds of millions of dollars put on the wall, but when someone takes the environment away, that needs to have a relative cost – so 100 million can be put against 100 million.

In that context the issue of offset environmental rehabilitation is considered to be an oxymoron, because real evidence is that you can't replace the current environment, you merely substitute it with something else, but its not the same. The same then applied to the social issues, we believe that a very strong component of that ought to be the visual amenity, and that's not just visual to neighbours, but to people who might use...

[End of Tape A]

[Start Tape B]

Max: ...in amongst all of the other votes when the ranking is done. So in summary, if we're going to move into the selection process or any sites 11, or 9 or 12 or 21 then we would also suggest that the triple bottom line approach means that valuing social, environmental and economic means that somewhere in the middle there has to be that part where they all meet. And we would argue that simply using economic terms and perhaps social terms and ignoring environmental terms in dollar values is not a fair equal judgment.

Colin:

I'm very aware of time it's 9.25pm. One of the important things about tonight's discussion was that it wasn't designed to produce a particular outcome or decision. We were wanting to explore this idea of the proposed site selection process and the 21 down to 11. I think people have raised a lot of questions that still need further clarification before we can really proceed with that point. What you've given us and the facilitator's have collected...you'll see the information on those blue sheets... that information will be provided back to me and collated separately, but provided back to you with your individual responses to your workbook. So you will get from me, direct through the Water Corporation because they mail it, a summary of each of the group's assessment, you'll also have a tape of our discussion and a summary of the workbooks that will go back to you.

So very much tonight's discussion was to explore and discuss these issues, not to come to a decision. And I appreciate the energy and commitment that you have shown to do that tonight. So I thank you very much for that. The information that you have given both through the facilitator and in your workbook, I will analyze that and send that back to you – it won't be on the basis of decisions, but summarizing what has come out of tonight's meeting, and then for discussion further down at the next forum. Now the other question I'm asking, you'll see on the note on the workbook that there are two proposed dates for the next forum.

The reason they are where they are I guess are two fold, one is the availability of key people – particularly myself, but also that the Corporation needs to have some time to get the information together. So I've suggested two possible dates on a Monday evening in July. I'm also asking for those people who would be willing to work with me to start to design the next forum if you would indicate that, and I will take responsibility to inform all of the registrants who those people are, and then I would initiate a meeting with those people to discuss the next forum.

I'm just aware of time, I don't want to go past nine thirty and can I say thank you indeed for your time...17th and 24th thank you...the other question that some people have raised is that there is a lot of food left here tonight and if you have agencies/groups who you think that food could be distributed to we've had a couple of suggestions, or you want to take it yourself, please feel free to do that.

But if you would fill in the workbook and indicate which of those dates is your preference, and basically it will go by the number the most preferred preference for the next meeting. Thank you very much for your attendance, feel free if you wish to take some food, if you wish to ask any more questions of the Water Corporation people or myself or the facilitators, thank you very much for your attendance on the evening.

[End of meeting]