

## The 3<sup>rd</sup> Deliberative Forum Transcription

### [Opening of meeting]

Independent

Facilitator

Colin Penter: I'd just like to let those people know that since the last forum I've met twice with groups of people from this event. One of those was with a number of the residents and progress associations and the second meeting was last week with those participants who'd indicated a willingness to be part of the advisory group and I would like to record my appreciation to those people for meeting with me and expressing their concerns and views which I have fed back to the Corporation and have resulted in the structure of tonight's forum.

I know from the feedback I've received, that many of you are concerned about the progress of the forum some feel we're moving too slowly and want to get on with it – others feel we're moving too quickly and that you're being rail-roaded down some pre determined process and outcome before concerns and questions have been answered. I've tried to take both views seriously. My position has been that I've been trying to get the corporation to respond to concerns and questions that people have raised and to acknowledge that they need to be answered before we can move forward, and I've presented that view forcefully to the Corporation.

You'll find that there are a number of documents on your table as well as the workbook there were some additional answers that the Corporation put together to questions that hadn't been answered in the detail that was requested in the material sent to you. So there are some additional answers. Also on your chair was a response sheet for those people who would like to go on a site visit to the Wanneroo Treatment Plant. If you could complete that indicating whether you prefer a weekday or a weekend and if you can return that to Steve MacKenzie, then that will be arranged on those two dates. And those two dates were what was requested in the last forum - a weekend and a weekday – and that will be to the Wanneroo Treatment Plant.

Also on your table, acting on the suggestion of the advisory group, there's a register of questions asked, so you know what questions were asked and when they were answered. And people who've asked questions I'll ask you to have a look at the register and give me feedback about whether you're satisfied with the answer that is being provided.

The hope tonight is that we will make some real progress to address some of your questions and concerns. And I'm hoping that by the end of tonight we would have made some progress towards that end. On that basis, Peter Moore who is the Chief Operating Officer for the Corporation and a key member of the Executive of the Corporation is here tonight and will talk to some of those issues. Peter will talk for about fifteen minutes and then there'll be an opportunity to ask him questions or seek clarification. I would ask that those questions focus on Peter's presentation and any major issues that he's able to respond to, rather than specific technical details. Water Corporation people here can answer those later.

The plan tonight is that the Water Corporation will also identify what it believes are real sites based upon one criterion around a financial benchmark. The Corporation's presentation will identify which sites it believes are viable from a financial point of view. That should narrow the sites down somewhat and hopefully remove some of those sites that I know some of you are concerned about.

Following Peter's presentation and questions we'll work in the small syndicate groups again to continue the work of last forum to discuss criteria that could guide site selection. The work that was done last forum has been summarized and is on the table for you. It is important to say tonight is not about making decisions about the criteria or applying the criteria. Following tonight's forum all the work will be synthesized by myself into a summary of the possible criteria. That will then be circulated to you for discussion and consideration before the next forum. So we won't be finalizing the criteria tonight, or the number of sites, but hopefully we will make progress towards that for the next forum.

I'm sorry it's a bit cold. The heaters haven't been working as quickly as we would have hoped. So I apologize for that. I'll ask you to welcome Mr Peter Moore who is the Chief Operating Officer from the Water Corporation who will address the forum for about fifteen minutes and then there'll be an opportunity for questions.

Water Corporation  
Chief Operating Officer

Peter Moore: Thanks very much, I hope you can all hear me and yes, welcome to mid winter. It appears as probably the only day of winter we're going to have at the moment but certainly a welcome relief from the winter we haven't been having so far although I gather that at these forums so far we've dragged you out into temperatures of 45 degrees in heat and now the coldest evening I suppose we've had and certainly coming up here this evening felt quite chilly but the rain fall, I can assure you, is very gratefully received by us and no doubt the rest of the community and it's good to see it getting into the agricultural areas. I gather it's even as far inland as Merredin at this stage so there's some real positiveness coming out of the last day or so. But I'd like to just address a couple of issues tonight with you really to put a point of view, I suppose, our position in some regard has been put in the past, so I'm reiterating some of the things that have previously been said, but happy to respond to that again.

The first of those really talks about or looks at the need for a Water Treatment Plant in this area and I know that a couple of our people Keith Cadee and Richard Walker have addressed you previously, nevertheless there seems to have been some further discussion about the potential do we really need a treatment plant, and I'm standing here before you tonight to say that's an absolute given. Mundaring Weir water and particularly the state it's in now, and in fact the state of all our dams at the moment are in a situation that regardless of how the water gets to Mundaring and then goes out of Mundaring and beyond, that water will need to be treated to ensure the disinfection is successful and the whole of the Goldfields agricultural water supply system. That really is a fundamental starting point of what this process is about. I can assure you there have been lots of debates internally as to are there other processes we could have gone about and those sorts of things and in fact with the Health Department. We've now been under some direction for some time from the Health Department wanting to know when a Treatment Plant will be built here and I guess you could say there's some debate with them whether they see the successful continued use of Mundaring without that Treatment Plant being in place. They're sensible to know that the whole system is dependant on

that, but nevertheless they're anxious to see a Treatment Plant in place in the earliest possible time frame.

The other issues I guess is questions have been raised is how genuine the Corporation is in regard to variant site selection and I know that's been an issue since this debate was started now a number of years ago. The various sites have clearly different dollar values associated with them. I trust that everyone can read that from the back of the room? But clearly there is a differential in cost with a number of the sites and reasonably substantial difference. Cost is not the only determinant of the site, if it was we probably wouldn't be sitting here tonight in this cold room. There would be other debates being had. And when you look at a multi criteria assessment, and in fact the criteria assessment that you as a group will come up with cost will be only one of those factors. Nevertheless, in realism you've got to take some credence to the cost. We've talked about a potential minimum cost of \$125 million going upwards from there. Now the Corporation is quite happy to look at – we prefer not to – quite happy to look at additional cost to the minimum cost option, but clearly there's got to be some bounds to that because the community of Western Australia ultimately, and you are representative part of that community, have got to meet those costs going forward into the future. So it's not only the Corporation at the end of the day, we'll have to have discussions with government about the relevant costs associated with particular sites, but equally with all of the other factors that go with these sites – environmental, social, and other factors that will go in a multi criteria assessment of the sites. And then there are other processes that will need to go into in final site selection and then getting on and building the particular Plant.

I'd like to spend just a couple of minutes looking at the process going forward from here and talking about that and where this part of the process sits within that because I'm sure that's one of the factors that people in this room would be asking themselves: well ok you spend a lot of time and effort working with us in coming up with some preferred options, maybe one, maybe a couple of preferred options where does that go from there? What credence does that have in ultimate site selection and in the site being selected and in the Treatment Plant being ultimately built?

That's the process that we're looking at initially in that top area... [Inaudible – no mic] is the process that you're a part of at the moment. With the community looking at values, setting criteria – there'll be other inputs from other government agencies as well in coming up with a ranking of sites. That ranking of sites will come up with some prioritization and that will feed into the further planning processes that will have to be undertaken because your criteria or your assessment at this stage will look at the available technical information but clearly there will be some further technical information that other regulators and others will require of us in going forward. Your information will feed into the continued assessment process as a first step. There's a bit of procedural stuff, I guess, in coming to and keeping you involved in – a community involved in the further assessment as it goes forward, ultimately the Minister also informed at that point, but only informed at that point, of the processes that have gone through and the preferred sites or site that are being looked at. The next part of the process is one where we go into the formal legislative approval processes having got down to some preferred site selections. That will require an assessment through the EPA setting of level assessment and going through whatever that level assessment requires PER / ERMP – whatever that might be – and at the same time, or at a slightly later time, a preliminary two works process that's required under the Water Corporation's legislation. In both

those events there's further opportunity for community involvement and community input. In the EPA processes there is often two or three stages of community input opportunities – the last of which occurs when the EPA issue their bulletin which basically says 'here is the site, here are the conditions associated with that site' the issuance of a bulletin, and appeals can be lodged against the bulletin before the minister finally sets the ministerial conditions. So within that side of the activity there is again, two or three levels of community input that can occur. In the case of the preliminaries to work again, there is an opportunity for community to assess and comment on a proposal if they feel a want to do so and if the objections that might arise at that point in time can't be resolved between the appellant or the objector, in that case, and the Corporation it is up to the Minister for Water Resources to finally resolve those objections and decide whether to either uphold the objection and ask us to go back and look at other options or alternatively to advise the appellant that the objection is being overruled. So there's quite a lot of additional community consultation processes after this process is concluded. Although the input that is going to come from this process will form valuable input and hopefully mean that some of those community processes are going to be a lot smoother going forward. All in all the whole time frame of that means that we're probably, hopefully, not more than a year away from actually getting to site selection but the EPA processes themselves take about a year assuming that we have adequate environmental information but it is important, as I said, because we are under not unreasonable pressure but pressure from the health department to get on and build a Treatment Plant to keep the whole process moving. And we very much appreciate your input into this process, we look forward to the outcomes of that but it is important that it continues in a timely manner so that we can get to a resolution on your preferences based on the criteria you choose in a near term.

John: As I promised, this is a very easy question that I'm asking. It would be helpful I think, if those who see a need for them to be given copies of those charts, the overheads that you've been using, could they be made available?

Peter: Yes certainly. I don't see any problem with that. Those last two charts plus the costing one?

John: Well I don't need the costing one, but that one and the preceding one. Some people see diagrams more easily – understand diagrams more easily than text.

Colin: For those who didn't hear Ken's response, he's saying that those documents will be on the website tomorrow but if you'd like a hard copy of those two flow charts, if you could ask Steve MacKenzie and he'll arrange a hard copy – a printed copy, sorry – to be sent to you. Thank you, John.

Participant: In the answers to questions that we were sent there was a response to an enquiry. The forum requested more information about environmental offsets and the answer given was this will be determined by the Environmental Protection Authority once the ultimate site is determined. I speak for a lady who has written in about this and she's pointed out that it's a bit late in the day for the EPA to come along when the site has been determined to find out how the fauna and flora are going to make out when they're going to be tossed off the site. So it would seem that the EPA has got to get in on the ground floor for the decision making of which site is the least traumatic for the local creatures and plants – is that clear to you?

Peter: Yes I got the gist of what you're saying. Two things about that, one is part of the site selection and certainly part of the process I was really inferring from after the community ranking of sites occurs there will be a certain amount of environmental information about sites that would have been discussed. The next part of that process is to go into more detail work in looking at those preferences and the environmental issues that might resolve with the site. In that time frame we are in discussions with the Department of Environment, sorry the Department of Environment and Conservation, as it is now representing the EPA and those sort of offset discussions occur early on at that point so that when our proposal goes forward to the EPA for assessment, that information is known. It doesn't occur right at the end of the process, it occurs relatively early on. The context of the answer that was given to you is very much dependant on if a site is selected and for arguments sake there may be sites that are in currently totally cleared land and the amount of offset will be then dependant on what the environmental impact is. Does that respond to your question?

Participant: [Inaudible question – participant speaking without a microphone]

Peter: No, the EPA would require it as part of our input documentation in doing their assessment.

Participant: Given that we need the Water Treatment Plant because of pollution with inappropriate or over-development in the lower Helena catchment etc, would the Treatment Plant be able to cope with possible future pollution from that Bellevue fire site, if the plume or the stuff leeches from that, or would it have to be upgraded to a better model in future to cope with possible problems and that in the future.

Peter: Sorry, I'm just thinking where Bellevue comes in. I think it was down stream...

Participant: Pollution that gets into the lower catchment that comes...

Peter: I understand the question. Where the Bellevue site, where the fire and industrial site was, actually feeds in down stream at the lower Helena Dam, so it...

Participant: So whether in future the chemicals from the plume will start leeching into that and when it gets pumped up into the Weir...

Peter: No it doesn't get pumped up.

Participant: We'll never get water from anywhere near that source?

Peter: No because that into the lower Helena River down stream where the dam is, so between that and the lower Helena goes to the ocean...

Participant: It would never be pumped up to be coped with by that Treatment Plant? What would cope with that then in that future scenario?

Peter: I don't know because we don't collect any water that's associated with whether that plume will go in.

Participant: And nothing will leech of that plume into any water supply into the future? We don't have to worry about that?

Peter: No, I don't believe so. You're basically on the Swan Coastal Plain at that stage and we're not tapping any water from there...

Participant: That's not getting in to any of our water supplies, you don't think, in the future?

Peter: Not that I'm aware of. That's really a question for ground water potentially that you need to ask DOE...

Participant: I just wondered if that was part of the pollution that we might have to deal with in the future with this plant...

Peter: Not from a drinking water perspective, no.

Sharon: Thank you. I just quickly want to follow up on the question asked before about environmental offsets. At one of the original meetings here, we were guaranteed by your environmental officer, and I believe she was the cultural officer, that it wouldn't be the tail wagging the dog this time, but it looks like we've gone right back to standard operating procedure. First of all, I don't see how we can make informed judgment without, there's never been a formal environmental assessment of anything in the Hills, so that's the first thing.

The second thing, we were guaranteed that the Aboriginal people of the area would be consulted initially, instead of at the end this time and also that we would be looking at environmental – I see that you're doing some taxonomic studies in the spring, but really, it's going back to the same old way of doing things which is in the end the EPA and the Aboriginal people have to twirl around and then the Minister overrides what they say anyway. So I don't see how we can make informed decisions I noted on here it says Indigenous Heritage Sites, but I don't see any on the maps. I just don't see how as a community we can even make decisions on what these areas are when we don't even know the environmental information and we aren't going to know it. It looks like we're just going back to the same old way of doing things, and I'm really disappointed because we were guaranteed publicly.

Colin: I'm going to take the easy way out and defer to Susan Brown and let her respond to that one.

Suzanne  
Brown  
Water Corporation  
Environmental

Approvals Manager: I'll rescue the Chief Operating Officer here. I'm happy to talk with you further about this Sharon in more detail but this is one of the most detailed assessments I've ever worked on in any Water Corp project. We did invite, I'm not the cultural officer by the way, this is outside my area of expertise, but I do know that we have invited the Aboriginal groups along to this particular meeting

Sharon: And that is culturally insensitive and improper

Suzanne: And we did also offer them, because we are aware of those issues, their own meetings or forums to attend – we did – and we have been in contact with them, and our own

indigenous issues group will be working with them as soon as the Aboriginal groups are prepare to come and talk to us so I can provide evidence on this...

Sharon: Excuse me, but the only letter that has gone out to the Native Title Claim is one that is inviting them to the general public consultation. There has been nothing else.

Suzanne: Well I'm more than happy to follow it up with you when I get back to the office tomorrow and be in touch with you and provide more detail. The issue of offsets and general environmental impact assessment it is a good question, because how much work do we need to do to before we can make an informed judgment about a particular site. We could go and spend 200 or 300 thousand (dollars) on every site right now and get all that sort of information on sites that we are pretty sure we're probably not ever going to touch including private land. So it comes down to a question of how many sites do we need to have it narrowed down to before we start doing those sorts of assessments and we are starting to do the flora and fauna surveys on some of the sites that we believe are potentially realistic and we'll talk more about those as we go on tonight, so I can give you more details on that.

The question of offsets, you're probably more aware of it than I am, of the EPA's offset position paper? We have to comply with that we go a lot further than that with a lot of our projects as well it's a minimum one-to-one offset for any land that is cleared, usually one to 150 per cent so like for like or better, and again, it's completely site dependant, so if we can find a site that is already cleared, we wont need to provide any sort of offsets for habitat.

Participant: When will we have an opportunity to look at the different sites? I personally will find it difficult to form an opinion without having a look at the sites first. I know that we are going to have a look at the Treatment Plant, is there any reason why we can't have a look at the different sites at the same time?

Colin: I can answer that as best I know. I think the idea was that yes, there would be opportunity for site visits and that that would occur once there was a smaller number of sites so that, as I understand it, the Corporation has said yes, it will provide the opportunity for site visits as it has with the Water Treatment Plant once there are a smaller number of sites to consider and I think what the Corporation is also intending to do and Robert might know the answer to this, the next forum is working on a 3D construction that will show you what the Plant might look like on some of those sites. Yes, Robert tells me that's correct. So you would have, as I understand, when there is a smaller number of sites the opportunity to physically view and visit some of those sites. Ken? Well I guess that partly is determined by how many of the sites are seen as viable or feasible. And that's partly, I guess, why it's important to try to get to that point for putting in place the physical visits to the sites. Am I right there, Ken? Does that answer your question?

Ken Walter  
Water Corporation

Manager Site Selection: I think on the program that was put up the last two times, we're certainly looking at the criteria now to try and develop the criteria and there's a box in there its going to be about forum four or five was when it was time to go and do some field studies. If you remember out of all of that we had our six or seven forums, but at the present moment,

forum three was when we'd try to get in to the criteria that we'd be able to go outside and actually have a look out and about.

Lois: Just a brief one, Peter. You mentioned in your slides a sum of \$125 million plus sum - could you tell us what the plus sum is?

Peter: Can you see that slide? When I said \$125 million plus sum the capital cost at various sites as a planning cost, capital cost as showing up on that slide. And when I said plus sum I guess I didn't want to be so specific as to say the cut off is here, I mean, when you get substantially beyond the \$125-130 million there's going to have to be good reason why there are additional costs being spent as well as if there is pure environmental reasons, for arguments sake, why lets say site one is not going to be satisfactory, then it drops off all together and then your comparator is with the next most viable site. So I don't want to stand here tonight and try and say that's the cut off point exactly, but bear in mind that additional money, as a result of a preference, against a site that may be a suitable site needs to be well argued. Does that sort of answer your question?

Colin: Is it possible to give some benchmark though, so there is some cut off point?

Peter: I don't really want to put a benchmark in. I'll blame Ken and say that he's put a benchmark of \$160 million there. I mean, without looking at the criteria that sounds to me, when you look at those figures, to be a pretty reasonable benchmark. But I would hope that you're going to come up and sensibly choose a site that is significantly less than that. And I could put a lower benchmark, but I'm not going to try that one either. But I think that's the sort of, when you look at that, there's a fairly big jump from there to the next level, and that's probably not a bad figure to look at this point in time as the upper limit. There seems to be a fair range of sites to be looked at in that zone.

Participant: Are we allowed to ask a question about some of the documentation that was circulated?

Colin: Yes, for sure. And who ever can answer it will do their best...

Participant: There's a document listed mapping and on the back of it a heading of 'table one - mapped non indigenous heritage sites in the Mundaring area' it lists a number of sites. And in respect to the Weir, it lists the Mundaring Weir Hotel, the Mundaring Weir Hall, the number one Pumping Station Museum, and the Mundaring Weir Gardens and Village precinct. My understanding is all of those particular elements are within the Mundaring Shire boundary. But I'm also aware of a significant study that was undertaken by the Water Corp into the heritage value of the entire precinct which extends across into the Shire of Kalamunda, the other side of the Helena River. And in that report it identifies significant heritage site below the Weir wall where the workers' camp site used to be. And my memory of that report, which I have seen only in draft form, was that the consultants recommended that site not have any form of construction activity on it. Now, it seems to me that if that's the case, even though it may not have been formally assessed by the Heritage Council yet, because it's a draft report on the Water Corp and they may not have submitted it - but I do remember the same report identifying all these sites that are listed here and in Mundaring Shire as sites that need protection and I'm wondering why there is no observation at the very least about the site that's in Kalamunda on the other side of the river which is right adjoining the number one Pumping Station Museum is not also listed in some form.

Colin: Megan from GHD is going to answer that one, I think.

Megan  
Dilly  
GHD

Ecologist/Environmental Scientist:: I will come around and talk to every table about the maps, because the maps in general are information that we can map at present. So there are a lot of social and environmental issues that we can't actually put on maps. The non indigenous heritage sites that are on those maps actually came from the Heritage Council, so went sent a map out to them to map sites that have been recognized by the Heritage Council or that are on their current assessment program. So there are lots of non indigenous heritage sites that are in Mundaring that are either on the Municipal Heritage Listing or have not been assessed, or have been assessed by the Heritage Council and they were found not to meet the criteria. So they are not actually on the maps at present, but they will be something that will be considered in the social and the heritage impact assessment as well.

Participant: My point isn't about that, the local government has a heritage register of its own. It's about this 700-page report that was commissioned by the Water Corp about four years ago that identifies a particular site that is not mentioned on this list.

Megan: I can chase that up report up with the Water Corp. At the moment, that was the information we got from Heritage Council. So there are certainly other issues there that we need to look at. And those maps definitely aren't definitive there's a lot of other issue out there that are on them and I will chase that up with the Water Corp.

Participant: Well perhaps the only issue is to ask the Water Corp, to reexamine this extensive heritage assessment report that it prepared and maybe submit it to the Heritage Council for examination.

Colin: For those of you who didn't know, I should have introduced Megan more forcefully. Megan is with GHD which is one of the consultancies providing advice to the Corporation. Megan was here, has been at the forums and some of you would have met her when she wanders around and asks specific questions. Sorry about that Megan.

Participant: I just want to know what the operating costs are, what time span that is? Is it per annum, per decade, per century...?

Robert Ng  
Water Corporation

Senior Planning Engineer: The operating costs that I have shown on the table here, they are what is called the total present value costs of all the future cash flows over the next 50 years. There are two components of operating costs, one is the pumping costs – the energy cost to transfer the raw water from Mundaring Weir to the Treatment Plant, and then the clear water up to the service tank either in Sawyers Valley or wherever. The other component of operating costs is treatment cost. And again, you've got yearly expenditure, but because they occur over the 50 year time frame, and also because it caters for increase in servicing demand they also rise gradually. So we actually take a present value of all the future cash flows and this is what we've got – roughly about \$158 million. They don't differ very much of all the options. This is the amount that the Water

Corp needs to put in now to provide for all the future operating expenses over the next 50 years. Does that answer your question?

Geoff: I'm just wanting to know what is the Water Corporation's position on using private property for this purpose is this week. Thank you.

Ken: In the hand outs is a copy of a letter which got sent out to a private resident who asked that question formally of the Premier. That is there in the question and answer and there has been absolutely no change from the policy of private land. I'll repeat that there are two private land policies around this area.

One is that if and when land becomes available in the catchment area the Water Corporation has a fund in which we will purchase that for catchment reasons if it is at a reasonable cost.

The second part of it is that the Premier has said that there will be no compulsory resumption for land for the Water Treatment Plant – that absolutely stands. However, on the same basis, if one of the preferred sites is private land, I would be obliged to go and discuss that purchase with the owners and if we could come up with a deal at a reasonable price it would be considered. But there was certainly no compulsory resumption for this project. There are two issues. One is a catchment protection and one is this project. I would think, that speaking to the people who have private land in sites three and four the chances of buying those blocks of land at a reasonable price would be zero.

Colin: Geoff, did you want to ask a supplementary?

Geoff: I'm fine, that repeats what you've said before Ken. I do note that there are no privately – all the red squares are gone from the maps – so you can infer from that maybe there is less focus on them from the Water Corporation's point of view.

Ken: I think it's quite simple to say that we as a Corporation at this function do not have the preferred site. So I would put sites three and four in the same category as many of the other sites at this stage – they all have problems. Site one has heritage/tourism, site below the Weir is National Park, the Sawyers Valley hill site is National Park, the air strip is RPZ, so there's not a straight forward answer if there was a straight forward answer we wouldn't be here today.

Participant: Can you tell me where are these catchment areas you class as catchment areas around Mundaring Weir and whereabouts near by?

Ken: Is that on one of the maps we're supplying today? It has been shown on several maps that we've come up before where virtually the catchment area, if you're looking up the pipeline area for example, the catchment area for Mundaring Weir itself goes out behind the CALM Depot land and up virtually the pipeline area and then around about Great Eastern Highway out. We've certainly got all those maps there, so they've been shown before. The blue shading on the maps which Megan has handed out today shows a catchment area. Megan can come around a bit later when you get working and she can point that out to you.

Participant: It's also west of the Weir road as well? Is it only east on the...

- Ken: Megan, can you just go for a walk up there now and point it out?
- Colin: We've got a few more minutes if there are any more questions. Peter has to go, so if there are any questions you would like him to respond to? Is there anyone else? Max has asked one – anyone else who hasn't asked a question that would like to and then I'll come back to you Max.
- Participant: In one of the answers that you gave to a question that you've answered in the hand outs, you've said that extra land may be required depending on the site in the future. How long do you expect the proposed Water Treatment Plant to last based on your current expectations without further planning or further infrastructure?
- Robert: Our project time frame is something like 50 years and we plan to have the first stage of capacity at 190ML and then it will increase to 250ML. The sites that we're talking about will cater for the full capacity of 250ML per day.
- Participant: So after 50 years you may look at increasing the current capacity and Treatment Plant.
- Peter: Just looking at that, I think that is largely dependant on the growth, population growth and the demand. I mean, there's multiple opportunities for, for arguments sake, there's a current opportunity for feeding Kalgoorlie from another direction. All of those things will come in to play over the next 50 years and the planning will depend on what's happening in that area at that stage.
- Ed: As time goes by, isn't the majority of the water that's going into Mundaring Weir already been treated? So we're going to be treating the water twice?
- Peter: Yes, in fact [Inaudible – interruption to tape] tannins and other things in the water and the mix of water does that anyway, and you need to treat that to enable the disinfection to work properly. So yes, you will be treating it twice. That's not all that uncommon and will become more common over time as new sources come on. And other examples for arguments sake – we're looking at the South West Yarragadee at the moment. That will be treated at source and some of that water will be stored in dams at different times, some of those dams may have treatment plants down stream of them again. It would be nice not to have to do that, but the state of our various sites doesn't necessarily permit that to occur.
- Jaël: I just wanted to go back to your earlier question; I think you and Robert both answered that. I think you said that the amount of water that the Plant is going to produce would depend on the population growth and demand. Do you envisage that the Plant will actually need to expand in size in the future so will more clearing potentially be needed in the future to add on different bits to cater for population growth?
- Peter: No the expectation is that the size of the plant – and Robert jump in if I get this wrong – that the size of the plant will cater for 250ML a day, so we may not clear everything that is required for 250ML a day initially, the size that will be set out for the plant will enable that clearing to occur though, so as that develops there may be some additional clearing, but within the defined boundary.
- Jaël: That your initial approvals were for?

- Peter: Yes
- Colin: We've got a couple of questions from people who have already asked a question is there anyone who hasn't asked a question, who would like to before I go to Max and Lois?
- Participant: My question is to a health and safety point of view with the site being 450 metres away from residents has the Health Department justified the chemicals that are being contained on that site and it's not a risk to people being 450 metres or 1.5 kilometres away from the site, when if there is a major spill, the whole town of Mundaring has to be evacuated?
- Peter: The chemicals that will be used in the Treatment Plant in this process are fairly commonly used in Treatment Plants. Mirrabooka Treatment Plant, for arguments sake, has residents across the road from it, Wanneroo is a bit more isolated – the one you're going to go and see – but there are Water Treatment Plants of this size all being comfortable co-located with population centres. The chemicals aren't of a type that a spillage would require evacuation of areas. The issue that has been raised previously is things like Chlorine buffers and that tends to be a leak of liquid Chlorine. In places where there is close proximity to population centres we go to other forms of chlorination. So there's really no concern that need be had about the chemicals that will be used in this process and their proximity to habitation.
- Participant: Mundaring Weir had a spill quite a few years ago and it was a six kilometre inclusion zone for people to be evacuated out of that area.
- Peter: That was a chlorine spill, I suspect; I'm not sure when you're referring to and that was based on liquid Chlorine. Liquid Chlorine does move down stream, it's a heavier than air gas now if there was any concern and we'd move to a number of our sites in the metropolitan area where we'd move to Sodium Hypochlorite [\[is this correct?\]](#) where a spill of that nature has no consequences. So again, we'd be looking at the impacts and what is needed in buffers for protection.
- Participant: [Inaudible – no microphone used to ask question]
- Peter: Our processes if there is a requirement for such things would be part of the operating regime of the plant.
- Colin: We've got time for two, so we'll take one from Max and one from Lois, so if you could just keep it brief and then we'll move back into the syndicate groups. Thank you, Max.
- Max: I've notice in this very good map which has just been put out here to Mundaring Water Treatment Plant Site Comparison social constraints around the Weir – site one is totally within the Shire of Kalamunda and the one kilometre site below the Weir, this new site that's being looked at is also totally within the Shire of Kalamunda. And I'm wondering has that community been consulted about these two sites going in their area? I'm aware that the Shire of Kalamunda as a Council has totally opposed site one but I don't think they'd have any knowledge about this one kilometre below the Weir site.
- Ken: Councillors such, yes they are aware of it. They have been invited to these forums or to have a representative here and at this stage they have decided that they don't have an

issue with the process as we're moving forward at the present moment. The issue in the Shire of Kalamunda is well away from residential areas obviously of Kalamunda Shire people, so they believe that the Shire themselves can handle it if and when we're looking at any sites which are in their area. They are aware of site one and below the Weir.

Lois: My question is to Peter. The Mundaring Water Treatment Plant, it forms part of the Integrated Water Service Scheme. Does that also mean it could also be able to service Perth if the Mirrabooka needed to be closed? And does that also mean that the South West Yarragadee water that is still in public consultation, if it is approved, will be able to become part of the Integrated Water Service Scheme and come to Mundaring Weir?

Peter: Some years ago back in the 80s Mundaring was a sole supplier to the Goldfields Scheme at that stage there were pipelines put in to integrate it. And the concept, the technical belief at that stage is that there would be occasions when Mundaring would be over stored compared to other dams and we could take water back into the Perth metropolitan area out of here, I think that has happened once. I think what has happened, is Mundaring Weir because it is in fact the lowest rainfall zone of any of our dammed catchments has been augmented from the metropolitan scheme. But yes, conceptually it is possible to take the water back. Reality is that it's very unlikely to happen. Waters from the Desalination Plant and South West Yarragadee will also be integrated as part of the IWSS, and yes they will be able to be put in Mundaring, or Canning, or a number of other dams. Because a number of those large sources coming on line are called baseline sources, so we've got to produce the 45 Gigalitres a year throughout the year and during the winter months when demand is down the demand wont require that water, so we're going to be storing some of that water in some of the hills sources on occasions. That will depend a little bit on the growth patterns, but does that respond to your question?

Colin: Thank you for your questions, it's about 7.35pm which was about the time we were due to finish. What we're planning to do now was to essentially work in the small syndicate groups. You do have a table facilitator on each group so for those people who aren't in a syndicate group, I'll ask you in a minute to, if you would, move to one.

Essentially the task is to continue last forum – to continue the discussion around the issue of criteria. Now, one of the things that the Water Corporation has talked to tonight is they've given you some indication around a financial benchmark as a criterion. So there is some beginnings of a benchmark that may provide some assistance in narrowing those sites down what I'm asking people to do tonight is continue to identify those criteria that you believe would be used to guide the selection of sites. Work was begun on that last forum and you have on your table a summary of the criteria drawn from the whole group. And you'll see that there's about 14 of them as I recall. For example, there is one criterion that people mentioned was about private property, but there are others.

In the small groups what I'd be asking you to do is to continue to discuss those criteria to try to identify possible criteria to guide the site selection. We're not having to make a decision, but begin to discuss and identify the criteria. Some groups last week got a lot further with that than other groups but I would ask you to revisit those criteria again, using the information that is on your table. Again, if you require technical advice, someone from the Corporation will come and assist you. If you need to ask me a question the facilitators will do that as well. Essentially our plan is to work for about an

hour, and then we'll hear a report back from each of the groups so you might want to have a look at the criteria that were summarized from last forum, there should be copies of those on the table. And the facilitators will assist you in that discussion. Feel free to help yourself to some food during this, and I'll call you back in about an hour's time.

[Break into syndicate groups]

Colin: Each group, what I'll ask if for either the facilitator or someone from each group to give us a report back. One of the things that's important about this report back, it that it enables it to go on the transcript of the forum. So that is one of the reasons that I want to give this a good half an hour, so we can record the feedback on the transcript. So could I ask each facilitator or someone from the group to give us a five-minute summary of the key issues that came out of your discussion? Remembering that this material will be summarized and presented to you in the material that goes out before the next forum. Chris, are you happy to start? Have you got the mic?

Chris  
Syndicate  
Facilitator:

We looked at the criteria that were there from the last forum, all the suggested criteria, and started working through those and went through to see whether they considered the criteria to be valid or not and then we had comments to make on each one and some we eliminated. And then we went back and put them in 'essential criteria', 'important', or 'to be considered', depending on which site was selected. So some were less important than others. So the three essential criteria that this group came up with was: No private property. If the owner doesn't want to sell it's not considered and that has been discussed at great length, but still felt that it should be in there; Distance from residents is another essential criterion that should be discussed when looking at each site; Small as possible environmental impact. Only sites with non indigenous or re-growth vegetation should be considered; and Minimal loss of flora and fauna.

The next three that were important: Least disruptive and best practices in terms of infrastructure. And again, that was probably a given but felt it needed to be in there and looked at for all sites; Economic and financial. It was agreed that it was a factor, but it wasn't the most important factor. They agreed that sites, probably the sites at the bottom of that list that we had earlier as presented by the Water Corporation, were probably not going to be viable sites, probably because of the cost and therefore probably could be eliminated from the list, but there's not cut off point that we came up with. There was a request from this group that those costings be validated independently because we just have a figure out of the air where it's considering some sites, and then other sites are not being considered because of cost – that that be validated in some way and not just saying 'well this costs this' and 'this costs that' so we're not looking at that site. Also delete the operating costs in that table because they were all similar for every site so they weren't really relevant and just added more confusion to the amounts that were up there. It was also noted that at some stage earlier in the process that people were given assurance that there would be triple bottom line accounting: social, environmental, historical and financial. But it seems to be that the key one that was put on the table tonight was just financial as the most important factor to narrow down the list.

And then the last one to be considered but least important was limited visual impact, because any site once it's picked should be looked at as having that limited visual

impact that all sites should be screened with native vegetation and will be looked at when the site is selected and be satisfactory to all of the residents.

The last couple of points that they made, were that all criteria be applied to all the sites not that some are considered on one site, and some are considered on another. And this group is comfortable to come to the next forum and apply these criteria to the sites listed. That's all we had.

Colin: Could I ask, when you say 'sites listed' were you thinking a particular number or...?

Chris: We didn't get to a number, because when the Water Corporation did their presentation they weren't really clear. They said benchmark 160 but they'd like some clarification. Are they really saying 160 and over won't be considered? So it wasn't very clear on that.

Colin: Thank you very much for that work. Thank you indeed. Should we move around? Leah? You're happy to provide a summary?

Leah  
Syndicate  
Facilitator:

Good evening, this group went carefully through the criteria as they were listed and we didn't actually get down to raking them but under the first point, the primary concern was that the Water Corporation should ascertain with private property owners who have dropped out of the process since the first forum to make sure that they're still up to speed on current issues and make sure that they're not left out of the loop in case of private property issues coming back into the picture.

Under point two there was the feeling that the two kilometre boundary was an arbitrary figure and was perhaps unrealistic and we're looking for essential criteria that perhaps the two kilometres would be a desirable boundary, but not realistic. There was also the feeling that two kilometres in a residential use area might be excessive, but would be acceptable in non residential areas.

Under point three there was great concern about the issue of night time lighting and the impact on invisibility to residents. They agreed that screening plantings were essential and they should be using endemic species with provident seeds - so seeds collected on site.

Under point four there was the agreement that there should be least impact on biodiversity and flora and fauna and no loss of endangered flora and fauna. There were also suggestions that cleared sites should be considered first and that vegetation and flora and fauna should be maintained wherever possible.

Under point five there was the question about industry best practice and what does that mean on an international scale and there was some question around access roads – so that if a road was already going into the site that the length of the road wouldn't necessarily be a criterion if it was already in place.

Safety – there was questions about buffer zone vegetation and how that would be ranked out.

Point seven there was general opinion that that point was good except there was a question as to the definition of 'human interest'.

Under point eight this group also agreed that economics is not the most important factor and may not account for the triple or quadruple bottom line.

Under point nine the opinion was that all points would be considered with reservations and appropriate impact assessment.

And point ten, which is the one concerning sites with historical or cultural significance, that that should not be limited to sites that are currently designated as significant and that that scope should be broadened.

Participant: With regard to the two kilometres we agreed, I believe, that two kilometres was desirable for residential areas or any area where people are dwelling on, but other areas that are picked then it could be nearer than the two kilometres zone between.

Colin: Thank you very much for that work and thank you Leah for that summary.

Group 3  
Syndicate  
Facilitator:

Our group discussed several criteria which fell under the broad categories of 'health and safety', 'visual aesthetics', 'environmental', 'social' and 'heritage'. Out of those five criteria the key aspects that came out were firstly habitat loss, visual aesthetics and impacts of the Plant including the lighting and also the ambiance.

In health and safety our group was particularly concerned about the transport of chemicals and the lack of permanent emergency services within the town to manage any spills that may occur.

Under social we raised a couple of issues that related to tourism, recreation, a distance to residents but also we looked at and explored the impact of future generations. When we looked at prioritizing the criteria our group felt that they couldn't actually prioritise. They felt that we need to take a holistic approach and that all of these aspects are equally important so we developed our little spider-web of all the issues and how they interrelated to each other.

Some of the important points that came out of the discussion particularly when we discussed applying these criteria to the existing sites, were that while we discussed which sites might be more applicable or more suitable to a Wastewater Treatment Plant, it was quite difficult to rule out or favour any other until the group actually got out and enabled a site visit to have a look at and assess these sites and make more of an informed decision as to which sites would be more appropriate. I think they're the key points. Did anyone want to add anything else?

Participant: Regarding the sites, everybody had a different idea of what they wanted. But what I'm think is could one of these forums be during the day on a weekend and we could get on a bus and all go look at all these sites.

Colin: I think that was certainly the intention. I guess the issue is how many it is feasible to look at. But I think that that was certainly intended that there would be that opportunity to physically visit some of those sites.

Participant: [Inaudible – no microphone used to ask question]

Participant: In our discussion we mainly looked at the map and the map had the first six sites that we looked at closely. I understand that a few on these 11 sites are private land which fell outside of our discussion anyway.

Colin: Ok, Brendan.

Brendan  
Syndicate  
Facilitator:

Thank you. We just had a couple of conversations before we got on to criteria. The majority of people at this table were not happy that all their questions has been answered adequately by the Water Corporation. They still are not convinced that the case for a Water Treatment Plant has been made conclusively and would like to sight the original documents from the Health Department stating that the Water is of quality that needs a Water Treatment Plant. They have never had that yet although it's been asked for they would like someone from the Health Department to attend one of these forums in the future so they could dialogue with the Health Department.

And also, the offsets for the site for the tanks have never been adequately addressed yet although they said they would be. There's a sense that what the Water Corporation has said they would do and what they have actually done doesn't match.

Then we talked about the information provided this evening. While people were happy with the maps being bigger and in more detail they weren't happy with the explanations given with them for the changes and alterations made to the new maps they received. I think some of those issues were addressed during the course of the evening but certainly in terms of the first half of the evening that wasn't presented very clearly and people would have liked one of these maps each instead of just on the table.

There was also a sense that, sorry going back – I missed one from the first question – that at least one or two people felt that the issue with indigenous people hadn't been addressed satisfactorily and that once indigenous people had been shamed or treated inappropriately it is very difficult to get them back in a conversation once that has happened. So maybe that might be too late to do that.

There was then some comment about the information provided by the Water Corporation earlier that the costings were still gross costings and there was no detail around that or no breakdowns that made it difficult to make any sense of them or the different plants – the operational costs. And also the overall costs. And people would have liked those costings to be provided before the forum tonight so they would have had a chance to look at them and think about them before coming this evening in terms of how helpful the process and information provided tonight. So those were some comments made by this group and then we got onto the criteria and looking at those. Again, like other groups I'll just go through these as we discuss them.

First of all, number one – no private property. People at this table were actually suggesting that we take out the word 'no'. Private property is an issue but not the fact that 'no' private property. Because what if someone who has private property wishes to have the Water Treatment Plant built on their property? That's always possible. Therefore that fourth dot-point under one 'only on land owned by government or land not

in private hands should not be included' so the issue – a criteria is private property but take out the word 'no'.

On the second criteria certain distance from residents – buffer zones. Again this group felt it was difficult to apply that criteria until they know the topography of the sites, and that means seeing them, but they were suggesting at least a thousand meters away from people.

The third criteria limit, rather than limited, but to limit visual impact for residents, This was quite important ensure that the Plant wasn't visible to residents but also to acknowledge that maybe that need to be negotiated with the residents who live nearby or next to the site what sort of visibility they wish to have of the Plant. So this group found it very difficult to make that decision on behalf of residents who were affected by the Plant. So the concept of applying that criterion to negotiating that with residents was a bit more important.

Number four – smallest possible environmental impact – dot point five, we took out the work 'no' loss of natural vegetation ensure minimal loss of natural vegetation because, realistically, that would be very hard to apply that. And also the next dot-point – only sites with non indigenous vegetation, to remove that – again because that's very difficult to actually have in reality. The other points we agreed with and wish to add the pine plantation site's preferred. To add that to one of those to make an additional dot point. Even if they are within the reservoir protection zone.

And number five – the least disruptive and best practice in terms of infrastructure was agreed on by this table and just adding to the last dot-point, least number of power lines, and lights and operating noise.

Safety – there was some sense that that was already incorporated in the distance from residents criteria, so that wasn't so significant here.

The limit social impact 'ensure that social impact is fully costed' – difficulty understanding what 'human interest' meant – interpreting that, so there wasn't a lot to be said there.

Then point eight – economic and financial – just to include in the first dot-point financial cost not the main criteria, points two and three were not relevant here but points four and five were all together: triple, quadruple bottom line calculations of all environment, social and cultural impact was considered important criteria here.

Number nine – the status of the sites, the last dot-point 'no natural vegetation' take out the word 'no' because again, as we said earlier, it's really impossible to do that, and incorporate or include another dot-point 'pine plantations' for this group, who want pine plantations in there.

Heritage and cultural – not on sites...rather than 'not on sites with historical or cultural significance' we talked about having something like 'evaluation of proposed sites for historical or cultural significance', Because that again is a bit of an unknown quantity. But that would be part of the process of applying that criteria. And protect heritage values built and non-built.

And then we got to the point of adding one more criteria and that was the concept of building infrastructure in the current climate at risk from terrorist attacks, so implying that if a Water Treatment Plant is a high risk part of the infrastructure for attacks by terrorists, then that might mean that it needs to be built away from residents who could be affected by a terrorist attack. So that was an additional criteria added by this group and that's where we got to.

Colin: Thank you, Brendan. We'll move on quickly to the next group.

Group 5  
Syndicate  
Facilitator:

Thank you. Our table spent the majority of our time discussing the criteria and trying to clarify and adding to that so that's what...and then we spent a little bit of time trying to prioritise.

So criteria number one – no private property – there were some land owners on our table who felt very strongly that there should be absolutely no consideration given to using private property and that is non negotiable and that needs to be put in writing by the Water Corporation.

Criterion number two – the issue of a buffer zone – reiterating what some of the other groups said we felt that there should be a suitable buffer zone provided on the topography or geography on the site.

Number three – limited visual impact for residents – we added residents and visitors, and we added noise impact to that, as others had mentioned, and also the lights there, so needing to screen light interference from residents and also consider the impact of that on wildlife. And also on that item we thought that not only should the Plant itself be considered but we also needed to look at the impact of truck routes and their impact on the surrounding community.

Item number four – the smallest possible environmental impact – the feeling was that we need to – the Water Corporation needs to use a fair and realistic measure to assess differences in energy usage between the sites for instance, those that are further away perhaps, and trucking distances and pumping distances questioning whether there should be some sort of a Carbon emission measure that could incorporate all of those energy consumption issues. Our table felt that biodiversity is more critical than just flora and fauna just in general, that that was a more critical item under the environmental impact, and felt that any vegetation removed should be replaced by at least 150 per cent.

Item number five, we agreed that it was an important criterion but had no other comments.

Number six – safety – again this two kilometre distance, rather than have an arbitrary distance there it should be whatever is suitable.

And limit social impact – again, not understanding the definition of social impact but we attempted to try to further define that as it relates to tourism and local usage and amenity.

Number eight – economic and financial – the use of the terms triple and quadruple bottom line were not generally understood, and so it was suggested that replace that terminology with something more clear like going ahead and saying ‘the financial, environmental, social and cultural impact’ as the bottom point states. Further to this it was felt that the environment as we voted on criteria environment was considered the most critical and not the financial impact.

No comments on items number nine and ten, and number eleven we added another criterion which was the time that might be required to develop the site should be considered because there are some sites that could be more sensitive than others and it could prolong the time to which we would have a new Water Treatment Plant in and functioning.

So the feeling was that we should give priority to those sites which could be developed more expeditiously than others. Then we went back and quickly did a bit of a vote on what we considered to be essential, important, and to be considered – and only one item, safety, everyone considered that to be essential, the others we just recorded our votes and hope that will add to the data that you have available there. Another general comment that was captured by the group was that there was some question to the methodology of the financial numbers that were presented tonight.

It seemed that the operating costs, people were concerned that they weren’t larger, actually for the duration that they covered and felt that by not including, by taking into account tax advantages and tax write-offs that you get for the capital and the operating costs, it’s not exactly a realistic representation of the true costs to the community for the project so it was felt that those should be the tax advantages should not be taken out we should be looking at the real cost – and again, there was surprise that there wasn’t more differential in cost between the various sites that are located further away, so there was a question as to whether or not they were very detailed cost estimates. Did I capture everything?

Colin: Thank you. And the group down here with Amanda.

Amanda  
Syndicate  
Facilitator:

Thanks to my group Bernard, Karen, Marina, Adrian, Jael, Beth, Stephan, and Mike. You did a really great job and I enjoyed working with you tonight. Basically we didn’t have time to go through all the criteria properly and we also didn’t get a chance to really adequately prioritise them, but I’ll have a go at what we did get time to do.

The first one – private property – the group was actually divided as to whether this criteria needs to be or the way it needs to be considered. Perhaps the process of negotiation for land sale may be looked at i.e. what pressure is applied and what process would basically occur. There were some people that thought that people shouldn’t be able to stand in the way of the greater community view. The greater community view should prevail in the sense where, if private property is the most appropriate place then we should be looking at it on a case by case basis in any case. Second one – certain distance from residents – this table thought that a substantial buffer zone is necessary, but not necessarily the two kilometres. This buffer zone should be decided in consultation with the community.

The next one was perhaps looked at the wording instead of 'limited visual impact for residents' could be 'limited amenity impact for residents' and this could cover things such as visual impact also traffic, noise, dust, light, property values. Another important one that the table thought was truck routes need to be considered being not through residential areas so the impact of truck routes and potential road accidents should be considered with particular emphasis on need to talk to emergency services and get their input and perhaps have mock trials for incident responses and also accessibility for tourist. So that all really comes under amenity and I guess a bit of safety as well. There was a criteria under that one also that perhaps compensation for those that are close to the Plant that actually end up getting the Plant near to them that actually decided that they wanted to buy a hills property with beautiful views but are now impacted upon, so compensation for those affected.

Next one was the environmental impact. This one was seen by the group to be the most important criteria so we looked at adding a couple of points to this one. One was no overall loss of threatened flora and fauna. It was seen to be important to do an independent seasonal survey of flora and fauna to accurately capture what is there at the moment, what could be affected. And protecting the integrity of the surrounding vegetation looking at a hierarchy of concern for the flora and fauna and environmental impacts. No overall loss of habitat, looking at spread of die back, looking at the hydrology of water at the run off into the bush.

There was a good point that offsets could be within – needed to be within a timeframe – a timetable needed to be allocated to offsets and followed through with, and in fact another criteria that this group came up with was an independent assessment of the commitments that are made by the Water Corp needs to be followed up when the Plant's built and to make sure that everything is followed through with.

Least disruptive and best practice in terms of infrastructure technical details – just least environmental impact. We didn't really cover safety a lot.

Number seven – limit social impact – there was another query with what this actually meant, but perhaps a social values study could be undertaken?

We didn't look at number eight.

Number nine – status of sites – National Park also needed to incorporate conservation or nature reserve and our group was split 50-50 as to whether National Park should be considered on the edge of national park might be considered by some people if the particular vegetation wasn't considered to be pristine, but again, we'll need to have a community view on what was or wasn't considered to be pristine because sometimes that can be a bit subjective.

Number ten, again there was the emission of the indigenous consultation on all sites that needs to be put in there. The second dot-point in number ten – protect heritage values: indigenous and non indigenous, built and non built – needed to be added there, and just one other point the most important one was number four, the essential one was environmental impact followed closely by two three and seven which could almost be amalgamated into one point under limited amenity impact to residents. There was an idea from this group that in terms of visual screening perhaps a neutral group of hills

people could come together to decide how visual screening could take place and then perhaps bring it back to the wider forum for consideration.

Colin: Thank you Amanda, and thank you to all the groups for that work. You've just given a very substantial summary in five minutes of a lot of discussion. Essentially with those criteria you get a sense that while we weren't trying to set priorities we're starting to get a picture of some criteria that are important to people here and hopefully what I will do [End of tape 1]

...that information will come back to you for the next forum as a summary of the criteria and where some priority was accorded to those criteria. And that will be the basis of the work for the next forum. To take collective work and try to take it a bit further and then to begin to see if we can get the criteria that you believe are most important.

So we have actually, we are beginning to get some criteria. Some of the question, hopefully many of the questions are beginning to be answered – I know some of you have said that you are not satisfied that they have been, and there is a register of questions that I will maintain and I'd be happy for people to inform me if there are questions that haven't been answered appropriately.

You've also raised some issues that need to be considered in terms of the next forum about site related information, about site related visits, about the presence of people like the Health Department, so there is a lot of information that can be used in designing the next forum.

I would ask that you complete the information about the visit to the Wanneroo Treatment Plant if you wish to go and pass that over to Steve. And the workbooks, either I'm happy to take them tonight or just post them back to me as soon as possible. There will be information sent out to you from tonight's forum the flow charts from Peter's presentation, unless people want them straight away, Steve will include those in the mail out for the next forum. If you'd like a hard copy of those hand outs could you see Steve and he will arrange that tonight.

Can I just thank you again, we've reached close to 9.30pm, thank you again for your time. We've suggested two times for the next forum on the workbook, and if you can indicate your preferences then I will try to communicate those through the Water Corporation to you as soon as possible.

Ken Walter just wanted to say a couple of words and then we'll wind up for the night. Thank you very much.

Ken: Thanks Colin. Actually to put it bluntly, I'm overwhelmed. I really would like to thank you very much for your input tonight, and obviously from the previous forums it's always with quite some trepidation when I turn up to meetings like this – community forums – certainly coming here tonight was one of those types of trepidation. The professional manner in which you have conducted yourselves tonight and presented what you've presented tonight in your summaries is very much appreciated. As I said, I'm overwhelmed I'm most appreciative of the professional way which you've all gone about it tonight and, just hopefully we'll continue in this way and hopefully get to a result in a few more meetings yet Colin. We've still got a fair way to go. But seriously, thank you very much for your input tonight. Much appreciated.

Colin: Thank you again, and travel safely.

**[End of meeting]**