

The Water Corporation Mundaring Deliberative Forum

Forum 4- 28th August 2006

[Opening of Meeting]

Presentation- Colin Penter

Colin Penter: For those of you, who don't know me, my name is Colin Penter and I am the independent facilitator for this deliberative and consultative forum. Can I thank you for attending this evening, and I should explain that we are meeting here tonight because the Mundaring hall was booked at the time the water corporation made the booking. So this is the alternative venue but we should be back at Mundaring hall next forum. Just to clarify a couple of things so you are aware of, things that have happened since the last forum, a number of people have requested additional copies of map which were sent out by the water corporation the feed back from the workbooks has been used extensively in planning tonight's forum, thirty-one people took the opportunity to visit the Wanneroo treatment plant and for those who didn't go there are skematic diagrams, that were handed out on the day, of that plant and they are over on the table.

Another thing that has happen Megan Dillie and I from GHD met with the small group of about thirteen people who just meet to talk about planning for the next forum, one of the issues discussed was the request that the water corporation approach the Health Department regarding clarifying the advise the department had provided, that information has been sort and as I understand a response with be provided as its received.

You have received an updated version of the questions, with my assessment of the status of the questions, if you are one of the people who have asked a question I would welcome your feedback about whether I have accurately reflected the current status of the answer. If you don't feel I have reflected accurately I would welcome that feedback. Essentially the register will get updated after each forum, so there is a record of questions asked. The other thing just to be explained is GHD are soon, properly next week, are to be conducting a spring flora and fauna survey on a number of the sites that I believe are on government land. If you have questions or queries about that you may want to approach Megan.

In terms of tonight's forum we hope to do two things, one is we plan to provide more information that will continue to answer questions and concerns that have been raised. We have three speakers tonight, we also have a couple of additional guests who wont' speak but which you may wish to ask questions of. There will be a presentation by Robert from the Water Corporation to show you the 3D simulation that the Water Corp is beginning to develop. Robert will talk a bit more about that. There will be a presentation by the Office of Water on the reservoir protection zone and a presentation by GHD about the chlorine and chemical hazards. GHD will be back again next forum to talk about that issue further.

Then in the syndicate group discussion we want to look at the concerns you have about hazards so GHD can address those in the September forum. We want to get endorsement of the essential criteria used to narrow down sites to a smaller

number for more in-depth analyst, and on your table is an A3 summary of those criteria. Those criteria were an outcome of the work from the last forum, and they attempt to summarize the criteria and the ranking that various groups accorded to that.

In the September forum we hope to begin to apply those criteria and to explore some of the site information in more detail. I know with both the feedback in the workbook and feedback to me that some of you would like to down to specific sites, would have like to have gotten there more quickly, but then again there are others that have felt that we are moving to quickly. My position is that we need to get information from the Water Corporation that you have asked and we need have a good discussion about the criteria and then you need to provided information about the sites and then we will begin to start to discuss narrowing the sites down. Many of you also said you felt uncomfortable discussing sites until you've visited some of them. The Water Corporation has put on your chair has put on you chair two visits to possible sites on government land. Not all sites, just those on government land the dates are Wednesday 13th September and Saturday 16th of September, there should be sheets on your chair and if you would like to be part of that if you could complete those and hand them to Steve MacKenzie either tonight or post them back to him.

It is expected that next forum there will be detailed site information certainly there will be some site information provided tonight, but more detailed site information will be prepared for the September forum, hopefully we will also be able to have some of the essential criteria identified for us to begin to apply to some of those sites.

The plan for this evening is that we will have three speakers then we will take questions from the floor after all three speakers. It is just easier to have the speakers speak then have questions on all three at the end. Then we will take questions and clarification either about presentations or other issues, we will then take a break, then work in the syndicated groups for about an hour on a couple of tasks. What we will do firstly is just introduce you to the speakers and the people who are here to answer any questions. You know Robert Ng already from the Water Corporation, many of you would have met Robert before, and he is going to demonstrate first a 3D simulation showing the proposed plant on a couple specific sites. The reason is to simply show you once there are four or five sites identified as possible options, what the Water Corporation can do to allow you to consider those sites in more detail. This is just an example, it will be used in future forum; we just want to show you what is possible.

The second speaker is Steve Watson, Steve is from the Department of Water and Steve is the Program manager for preparation of the Mundaring protection plan, he will talk a little about that plan and particularly about the reservoir protection zone issue.

The third speaker is Dave Allan from GHD, which is the engineering and environmental consultancy firm. Dave is the manager of the risk management group within GHD. One of his colleague's, Matt who cant be with us tonight, the will be here at future forums to talk about hazards and risks management, so Dave's presentation will be first of a number.

Another representative is Reg Yaran, Reg is from the Water Corporations Indigenous resources branch. Reg won't speak on the forum but is willing to take questions from the floor or speak with groups about the consultation of Indigenous stake holders. I know there are a number of you that want to bring up issues with the Water Corporation about the leeching of water from the hill. Steve Wilky is here, Steve is from the Water Corporations environment branch, he can respond to any of those questions.

Any of those guests will answer questions during question time and you can pose questions during the discussion. I will hand over to Robert, if you could hold your questions until all the speakers are completed. Also Neil Herbert from the Water Corporations chlorine safety unit, so if there are specific questions he can take them as well.

I'll hand over to Robert, there will be three presentations; Robert will go for about 10 minutes, Steve 10 minutes and Dave from GHD for about 20 minutes. Then we will take question.

Robert Ng: The Water Corporation will endeavor to answer all questions as Colin has pointed out. We had lots of questions and one of the questions that were raised in the first forum was the 3D visualization of the sites. I believe questions were also raised in the previous community consultation, but weren't properly answered. So we embarked on buying some tools and the software that can provide some accurate realization of what you can see from the air as you fly over the sites.

A few things that I must point out are that this is the first cut of the visualization and it's not complete. So you may see a few mishaps but you will still see what you came to see. When you see and fly over the sites it shows you a lot of things you are unable to do, even if you go and visit the sites because you are unable to hover around 300meters above and do a 360 and come back safely.

I started from behind the reservoir and I fly over the weir, and it goes to the side below the dam, what you are looking at is the site which is 1km below them, which is downstream of the dam which is a 20km site which we propose as one of the options for the treatment plant. Further on you can see there is site one, which is in the middle of the weir, it is for the treatment plant and the additional area is for the slush drying bed. We flew over the site 1km weir we are now flying back over the weir to the CALM site. What we will do is a 360 around this CALM site; you can see a visualization of what the treatment plant would look like at the site. That is Jacoby Park and Allan road, the outdoor cinema and the forest. The blue lines is the Mundaring Kalgoolie pipe line, so we flew at about 300m then came down to 150m and is about to do another 360, before he goes to look at the pine plantation. This is the proposed clear water tank which is going to be much smaller than the one at Sawyers Valley. That is the treatment complex; this area is the slush drying bed. These are some of the additional treatment process that we put adjacent to that.

We are finished with that, now we are coming up to the pine plantation. We are circling a 360 and then heading north. I haven't put the treatment plant site on this side because we haven't finished this visualization and there is a fair bit of work to try and put the treatment plant of this site, you have to try and erase them. That is the air strip, so we fly over, now we are back on the CALM site and we are heading north. You can see the pipeline; we are heading to the Sawyers valley

we are basically flying over the Mundaring Kalgoolie pipeline and heading towards those sites. We are now going to bank left and fly over site number four. This is private land we are looking at. It is about a 20 hectare area, we are going to do a 360 and go to Sawyers Valley tank site. That is the Mundaring weir road. Darken Street. We have finished with site number 4 we are going to go look at site 5 which is the Sawyer valley tank site. I have done a fair bit of work here to put the treatment plant there. This is what it looks like. That is an existing 50 Meg tank that we have just finished building, these are the two 9meg tanks. The proposed tank site has two additional new 50 Meg tanks that are proposed for that site.

We have now finished with that Sawyer valley tank site and we now come up to site 7. That is Poison Lease road. We are now heading back South to look at site 3, which is a square like block and then we fly back to the weir. We are back at the CALM site and then follow back to the weir where we will finish the presentation.

When you are in your syndicate session I will show this on repeat basis for anyone that would like to see it in greater detail. Thank you.

Colin: If you can just hold you questions for Robert until we have had the other two presenters. As we said the purpose of that was simply to show you what can be done, not to begin to have the discus of the simulation and the site consideration, simply to show you what is possible when and if we can get down to a number of sites.

The second speaker is Steve Watson. As I said Steve is from the Department of Water, he is the program manager for the preparation of the Mundaring protection plan, and he is going to talk about reservoir protection zones. Thank you Steve.

Steve Watson: My department doesn't have lovely visuals like that, actually very impressed, might try and get that for our own reservoir protection zones. The Department of Water is here to give some idea of a reservoir protection zone, why they are there, what they are. It is important for site selection issues. Effectively reservoir protection zones or prohibited zones as they known in legislation in the Metropolitan Water Supplies Sewage and Drain act. Occur in the Perth hills and comprise of 2km distant around the highest water level mark of a dam. So it is a fairly extensive area, they only occur within the proclaimed drinking water source areas and the public source areas are either catchment areas or water reserves. They are only applicable in those areas; they don't occur anywhere else, there are specific zones that apply for drinking water catchment protection issues. The idea is to keep water quality as high as possible. They don't occur often, people take the 2km, look for the dam, circle and say, and well that's an awful lot of land. It's not quite that much because it doesn't occur out of the physical catchment of the dam, or the reservoir, it doesn't actually include land downstream of the dam walls. I will show you a picture at the end of the demonstration. The 2km is determined by the high water level of the water body, so it's not for the dam wall, but it does include the water body itself. So everywhere from the dam wall forward up to that 2km from the high water level, we term it the reservoir protection zone just because its an easier language then the prohibited zone.

What do they do? They help us avoid contamination. It's the last line of defense before the water is taken. The Water Corporation gets to treat it and make it safe

to drink. But obviously we would much prefer to start with a good quality water because there is much less treatment required and as far risk for public health, and we are talking a public health issue, starting off with a clean water is obviously what we want to achieve. It's the concept of avoiding avoidable risk, in reservoir protection zones and announce the protection and find a cure, its really what we are talking about. There is no reason you can't rely on the treatment, but you take the risk, if the treatment fails your going to drinking the less safe water. Obviously the public don't want to think that their water is anything else then absolutely safe, the quality of water coming out of your sources needs to be maintained at the highest possible quality, to achieve that you really need to keep unappropriate developments outside reservoir protection zones, whether that's recreational use or developments we really don't allow those within reservoir protection zones and the Perth hills I think many people would of visited and downstream of the dams the Water Corporation put facilities which are outside the reservoir protection zone for picnics and enjoyment, but you don't find them inviting people behind the dam wall into the catchment for any other recreational opportunities.

Part of identifying where the proclaimed areas or the public drinking water source areas or the drinking catchment areas all those terms are used in the state, we develop drinking water source protection plans. These plans are freely available on the department's website, we have got in the order of about fifty or sixty at the moment they are being prepared for all of the drinking water sources around the state, which are about one hundred and forty. One of my jobs is to keep them running over, to another fifteen to twenty this year and one of those is Mundaring. Mundaring has been on the cards for a few years. It has been to the local council, it has been to discussions with key stakeholders, but we are proposing to get it out there and finish it this financial year. We will be going out and talking to people about what we are proposing, where the reservoir protection zone is, where the physical catchment of the Mundaring source is. In those plans we will identify existing risk, because inevitable there has been decisions made in the past that we can generally correct. There are activities or approvals for facilities inside these catchments where we are saying it's not desirable to say people you have to move now. If you are having existing approved use, if you're a land owner in there we are not saying you now leave. Its nothing like that, you have the ability to stay there and do what you legally and lawfully doing under approvals, however we will be saying to people who think, that's a nice piece of land I would like to go develop there, we really don't want you in there and we will be planning to keep minimum development in these catchments, because at least development you got the better water quality you achieve. That's really the simplicity of it. There is a lot of literacy around about developed catchments compared to undeveloped catchments. An undeveloped basically natural catchment will give you a much better water quality in your storages.

So we're out for about 2006, along with the ability to proclaim these areas, the physical catchments, and there are penalties associated with by-laws that apply in them for people that clear, excavate or develop in them without approvals. That is just something that does apply under the legislation.

The 2km reservoir protection zone would look something like that. I think some of the information you have received identifies the areas where the Water Corp is looking at sites. Whether the reservoirs are in or out of the reservoir protection zone area and clearly from what I have just said The Department of Water would

not be recommending development within reservoir protection zones. It becomes an uncomfortable situation when I'm talking to other community representatives that want to do other things in these catchments and we allow development in some RPZ but not in others, so we take a very strong position of not recommending development in RPZ and anything that is approved within those would need The departments of Waters approval. That is all I really have, it is simple and straight forward, based on legislation. It has been working for us now for decades in terms of legislation, it all came about because of approximately a hundred years ago there was a typhoid issue in Victoria dam and 137 deaths in all. All of those historical things we have forgotten are real and they have happened in Western Australia. We haven't had them luckily since then and we don't want them so we are trying to maintain the quality of the catchment and one of the last lines of defense is the reservoir protection zones and we really don't want to support intensive occasion of land use in those reservoir protection zones.

Colin: Thank you Steve. Steve will take any questions after our next presentation. Our third and final presentation is from Dave Allan from GHD. GHD is an engineering and environmental consultancy, many of you have met Megan who is working on this project, Dave is the manager of the risk management project within GHD and Dave and Matt, one of his colleagues who has particular expertise in chlorine, who can't be here tonight will be here in future forums. This is the first of Dave's presents here. Dave will take questions after his questions, Dave, thank you.

Dave Allan
GHD:

Intro (was unable to be heard)

43 60 identifies exactly the various stages which you need to go through in the consultation or for any development essentially managing the risks associated with those developments.

The risk management process which is identified in the Australian standard there, one and two which is what we are introducing to you tonight. The first one, the very important one is called establishing the context. What that means is basically you have to consult with the community and you have to satisfy what you identify to be the hazard and what you consider to be the issues. You know the hazards and the issues, and there are risks associated with those, start with the context and then identify the risk. Without leading into this too much, is there a chemical risk, chlorine risk, there are transport risks, environmental risks etc. There are any number of different risks, some of them are going to be important to you, maybe there all important to you, but some will be more important than others. Then we can go more specifically into identifying the causes, consequences, how they occur, how they can be controlled. Then there is an analyze stage, which is a numerical analyze and consequence analyze. The evaluation then is a treatment. We're not dealing with three, four and five because at the moment we are treating this as the first stage in the consultation in the risk management process.

Establishing the context, the first box in the previous PowerPoint slide, what we look at is the two in red there, the accounting for the perception and values of the community and that's exactly what we are going to try to do in your first syndicate

session. Secondly is the development of the risk management criteria taking into account the community objectives. Three, four and five specify the nature of the decisions needed to be made, establish the policies for communication, although this is the main forum there may be others, identify the scope of studies required. What we are looking at here is us wanting to account for you perceptions what you perceive to be the important hazards here. Risk management criteria, there has to be criteria. This is well practiced not only in Western Australia but Australia wide, there is well established guidance for what risk is considered to be tolerable to the community.

In establishing the context, the perceptions and values this is what we are trying to get out of the first syndicate session. With respects to the development of this water treatment plant where ever this may be, these are the things. What issues of importance should a developer focus on? Safety, environmental, cultural others specifically what are the issues to deal with? What hazards are preserved by the community and what level of risk is considered tolerable? These are the things we need to try and determine tonight and the next hall which we associate.

Perceptions and values for example here, the obvious ones the chemical risk, the risk where myself and Matt most commonly deal with are the chemical risks. The first one, nature of hazard, for this first one here which is continuous chlorine emissions, lets just say there are no continuous emissions. Let us take that one out of the way, in our trade continuous emissions are called fugitive emissions. The sort of things you get for that is a background odor; just to make clear for water treatments plants you don't have that. There is a probability that chlorine releases can occur, but if they do they are accidentally releases, it would take a lot to make one happen, but accidental releases so they would only occur on very rare occasions, there are no continuous chlorine emissions. The chlorine spillage on site, what can occur there? You can get fatalities, in open areas and open space, fatalities may be possible. You can get injuries, can be an odor nuisance, it may be the risk may be localized so you get injuries and fatalities to people that are working on the site. Generally working on the site isn't the issue, which is an issue to the community, but it may be when people from the site are living within the community, so having a safe working plant is something that is important to you.

Transport accidents. We may have to transport the chlorine from the cities to the plant, the dosing; you can get fatalities or road accidents, damage to property what we perceive to be the main issues there. Site traffic maybe it's the amount of traffic, maybe it's the traffic that is the problem, just the volume of it, maybe its environmental damage. Or perhaps the safety hazards are going to be a problem for you, maybe its your perceptions of hazards and risks really its more these non safety things, the contamination water discharge, bush fires, damage to vegetation, ground supplements, loss of amenities, visual impact etc. Maybe these are the bigger issues too, some of these issues in fact are more difficult to manage, with the chemical risks we can design an amount, or at least make the probability of occurring much more manageable, where we can actually do something about the chemical risk. But being open and honest here in this forum stage one of the code tells us we have to canvas the community to get the views of what the main issues are, even if they do prove to be very difficult ones to deal with.

Something that is always tricky to discuss is a tolerable risk. This is fatality risk; these are considered to be tolerable fatal risks. This table here is what is considered to be tolerable fatal risks, by normal planning processes. No fatality is what everyone wants and no fatality is properly what everyone one will get, but there may be ways in which fatalities may occur, it may be a long chain of multiply jepodies that you would need to get to one, but they may be possible in some way.

The Australian legislation is very good for this; it has embedded tolerable risk in its planning law for many years. It's way ahead of many European countries. What do we have in Western Australia there is a residential risk of one fatality per million years. That is considered by the authorities to be acceptable. So basically if you can make you plant safe enough and remote enough from the community, such that you can by the way you do the analyze, which is dictated to you anyway, using the prescribed analysis, if the results shows you its 1×10 to the 6^{th} it is considered tolerable. You can apply that different ways, you can apply that residential as meaning a group of houses or you can apply it to mean a single residence. There is some flexibility in how you apply that, generally speaking we would apply that to mean a single residence, and I would actually take a more conservative view on that. If you read the law it doesn't necessarily have to be that. I think in this case we would take residential to mean a single house. Where we are developing her it would be the most relative interpretation of it. Hence the various schools and hospitals you will see there the tolerable limit is stricter, reasonably, children are more vulnerable, old people are more vulnerable.

Commercial development 5×10 to -6 open spaces 10×10 to -6 , ten per million and on the site boundary fifteen per million. That is what we use in WA. If you look at NSW it is similar but better because it gives an injury risk which we don't have in WA. There is a serious injury risk of ten per million years and serious injury would be a sickness not a fatality, but it would be sickness that perhaps required hospitalization. You also then have an irritation, which would be coughing, eyes watering and there would certainly be a very strong odor. And there we have fifty per million years. So although they're not embedded in the WA legislation, I think they're very useful criteria. They are quite strict criteria as well, they are ones in which we also could apply. In Victoria we have a slight difference; the residential risk is actually ten times stricter. The Victoria legislations are in a draft stage, but they have been in draft since 1889, but never the less they are applied. So Victoria risk is actually .1 per million years in residential areas, so a much stricter target and at the site boundary its 10 per million years. For some reason or other in those two categories the Victorian legislation is stricter. They are on the tables pointed out.

Those risk numbers, there are any number of ways of performing risk analysis, there are a number of data sources you can use, logic trees you can develop to do it now, to overcome that problem the state does actually prescribe the approach you have to take to do your risk analysis. The rule sets which basically unpin the analysis, the rule sets are all defined for you. The assumptions are that there are individuals present at any locations were the safety contours are drawn; there are individuals present 100% of the time. Which certainly wouldn't be the case in a rural development, but that's the assumption in the analysis. It is assuming that there is someone that is present that will be exposed at all times. It is assuming that that person has no protection against any of the hazards, it assumes there are no alarms, no warnings, and it also assumes that the person

has no possibility of escape. So are all things that underpin the risk assessment. They are all highly conservative assumptions but they are the conservative assumptions that are prescribed for us. Which give you extra comforting too, into how safe the connection would be. For those to occur it would mean that the person would basically have to be asleep. The first one there, there is no way that can actually happen, its pure conservatism, in the others no protection, no alarms warning, no possibility of escape, those three could occur if someone was asleep or paralyzed or unable to move in any other way. So in those three there is some sort of basis for it.

That really finishes it, the next stage would be perhaps tonight following and between now and the next meeting, what we would then try and do is to identify the second park areas; identifying the risk, what can happen, how and when do they occur, where and when do they occur, who was exposed. Those are a lot more difficult, they are much more detailed questions we are not going to look to resolve those tonight, but maybe some of your thoughts on that would be quite useful.

Here we are getting to what is traditionally called risk assessment from this assessment we would start putting the numbers to it. You would then analyze this would be further down the road, we are properly two or three away from this, then finally we would treat, which is defining mitigating options, make chances then manage and evaluate the residual risk. Residual risk in this case would be all the risks once every recommendation for an improvement has been taken into account.

Colin: What we will do now is just take any questions, perhaps you can just indicate your hand, maybe identify yourself and who your question is for, I will then direct the question to someone who can answer. Karen, do you want to start off the questions.

Karen : I live on site four. According to the maps we have been provided and are on the website, site four has been modified; can someone tell me the reason for that? It has been reduced in size.

End of Tape Side One

Robert Ng: Site four the regional map shows them encompassing the entire private properties, I can't tell but it is really the entire area, since then we went in to look at what area would need to make up a 20 hectare site that would be sufficient to accommodate the treatment plant. What you saw in the 3D presentation was an example of a 20 hectare from some sort of selected lot in that number of residential area can be put together to fit a 20 hectare site for the treatment plant. So we have made some changes over the last forum and we were meant to present some sort of revised site boundary for all the sites, I think they are shown in some of the plans that we gave out last forum. Steve is that correct? Yes.

Colin: Karen does that answer that?

Karen: It doesn't make me very happy because now it's narrowed down to my place and the one next door.

Fiona: Could you tell me the address of site four?

Ken: Anywhere in site four we would be looking for 20 hectares and as Robert said in his last presentation roughly in the middle of site four he has drawn in 20 hectares. I will repeat what I said previously about private land is that we won't be resuming land at all, but if this forum recommends that we seriously look at site then as I have said before I would have to go and speak to everyone to see if I could buy land but you have to remember then, there is a chlorine buffer zone around that. So we really have issues, although we only have the 20 hectares shown, I suggest when you are looking at it in context, site four is anywhere in that area there until gets down to real nuts and bolts.

Fiona: By the shape of site four I would like to know the address. Could you come clear and tell us the address of site four.

Ken: Site four is any of the private land from the top which is Gerry's land all the way down to Darken Road.

Fiona: Why has the shape been changed?

Ken: I just said Robert has shown the size we will need to build the treatment plant.

Fiona: By the shape of it, it is exactly our property. I'm just letting you know we do not wish to sell. Can that take site four off the agenda please?

Ken: Almost Certainly.

Fiona: Good, so you don't have to consider site four anymore.

Ken: What happens if five other tables come back to me and say please go and see those lovely people and have a talk to them, I would have to do that?

Fiona: But you said that it wasn't going to be compulsory.

Ken: Correct. I think we can move on Colin.

Fiona: No, I think this is a very important issue that you haven't come clear with and I would like to know, it's very upsetting for us.

Ken: I can understand that.

Fiona: It's important and I would like some decision.

Ken: Every block which we have identified, and we have identified a lot because of the request from people here, every block has a problem. Number one yours is a personal problem, yes, like Gerry's and everyone else's.

Fiona: It's not only personal it's historic. That property was Mundaring vineyard, that's how Mundaring got its name. It was far beyond the weir and all this other stuff. Also the hill was called Mundaring, then our property was called Mundaring after the hill, it's a very historic property. I think poor Mundaring it would be a great shame if you took it to build a water treatment plant there.

(Unknown)...I think when the weir was built each of the land owners were told because of the weir their land would never be effected, if they agreed to the weir, I think that should be taken into consideration by the Water Corporation.

Ken: We have obviously looked at all the titles in that total area and all the stuff that is on the titles as well.

(Unknown): Legally? Because I think you will find that going back that there was an agreement.

Fiona: Could you please take it off, I mean if there are two or three others that are in that area but you have chosen our particular land.

Ken: If this group wanted to recommend that site as I said I would have to come back and talk to you, I don't believe that would be the case, but on the same basis that is an impediment to the treatment plant being built on that site, i.e.: its yours. Exactly the same are your impediments on every other site we have.

Colin: But Ken the point that I think Fiona is trying to make is the corporation has made the position that it wont compulsory acquire land and she is saying she wont sell it and I think that is suggesting that that site will no longer in that context a site

Ken: Is there somewhere else on site four that people would sell at a price? I don't know.

(Unheard conversations)

(Unknown 2): I think there is a sense of bullying when you say if the owners refuse to sell, what if someone next door sells? I think that is a bullying aspect which the Water Corporation has been charged with doing before.

Colin: I'm just aware that in a sense I want to provide an opportunity to discuss this issue because I think it is important, we also have other questions that we need to address. So I'm interested in the questions or the comments that people wanted to make about this specific issue. So I'm happy to take those questions but I don't want to explore the issue in a lot more detail. I think that maybe it's an issue you want to talk about in your syndicate groups in terms of a criteria, but given the fact that we need other questions to be posed to the speakers I would like to address those first. I know you are persisting.

(Sharon): I would just like to ask is it possible at this meeting with the majority of the land holders of that particular property being present can we vote on whether we want to drop that site, is there any reasons why we cant vote tonight on that one?

Colin: I think if you wanted to establish that as essential criteria in your syndicate group discussion that is precisely the nature of the discussion. If that's seen as essential criteria then that can be proposed.

(Sharon): Can we not as individuals vote right now to drop it or not drop it by show of hands? Is that not possible?

Colin: I'm happy if you want to take some feeling of this issue. The problem that I think we have got it puts people in a difficult position I feel somewhat uncomfortable

with, particularly because there are some people who are home owners that aren't here and I just feel that it just places people in a difficult public position at this point in time. My suggestion is that if the feeling of the syndicate group is at one essential criteria, as I understood people were saying last week if there are owners that don't want to sell their property then that site should not be a site and that is a recommendation that each group can make as an essential criteria.

(Unheard Conversation)

Colin: Sharon, I just think taking a public vote at this point on this issue is there are people that are affected by that issue that aren't here.

(Unheard Conversation)

Colin: That's true but what I don't want to do is place people in a sense that they have to indicate a view about this issue publicly. I not sure precisely what you want to take a vote on, that's another issue.

(Unheard Conversation)

Colin: Ok, I'm happy if people would like to indicate their support for removing and I think we have another view expressed here.

(Unheard Conversation)

Colin: It seems to me if there is going to a vote on an issue significant as this, I think people that have registered to participate should have the opportunity to contribute to that. I'm just concerned with us making that decision; there are a lot of other people who aren't here. One option is that those people should also have the opportunity to contribute to that. Those people should be informed that this issue is going to be voted on. That, I guess is my concern. Can I also suggest that this is an issue you propose as essential criteria for narrowing the sites down? That would remove any sites where an owner doesn't want to sell. I'm just hesitant about a public vote now when a lot of people haven't had a chance to contribute. Sharon I know you have wanted to comment.

Sharon : Councilor East ward Mundaring shire. I sitting here listening to this and I'm thinking duplicity rains simplicity once again. I have heard Ken state that if people don't want to sell it won't be compulsory taken and that site will no longer be considered. Now I've heard this number of times. All of a sudden I hear equivocation on this on a particular site. I would feel more comfortable if what ever process we develop it is developed publicly and it be done public because the great thing about the government departments, agencies and corporations is that they pick off groups one by one. So what ever they do, we may not do it tonight, maybe at the next meeting, I want it done publicly and I'm going to ask for that and that then that be followed as we were promised originally. So would that be alright?

Colin: So what you are proposing is a resolution that this be voted on and those people that have registered for this forum will be able to contribute to that.

Sharon: Should it require a personal notification or consultation on your part Colin? And to each person, then a group consultation, what ever process you come up with then its bought back to this meeting publicly on what happened then we can decide. My problem is like I said things get individualized and people get picked off.

Colin: Sure, yes. The gentleman in front.

(Unheard Conversations)

(Unknown 3)...If the size of the site totally occupies the whole of our property then the business is over and property wont be bought. It depends on the data presented to you.

Colin: I think though what the issue that was raised was a general principal about where people don't want to sell rather than drilling down into the specifics of this site, which we will do. I think Sharon suggestion is a compromise that I'm going to suggest. The logistics of it, it's difficult to think on my feet, I certainly feel uncomfortable with us making a vote now; I do take your point that that needs to be done in a way that is transparent and involving people. One option would be that the issue is presented for the people who have been part of this forum to deliberate on and some response come back and be analyzed by myself and presented to the September forum on that issue. Is that an accurate reflection of it Sharon? So rather than do it now we place that as a motion on notice that people could vote on and results of that would be presented to the September forum.

Sandra: I think it's very important that in that process that site the reason for that exact drawing of that site being the boundaries of Fiona's property be given to her by The Water Corp. Because I find that if you look at it it's a very strange shape for someone to just pluck something out of the air in a desktop study. It's deliberately drawn on the boundaries of her property and we want to know why.

Colin: The gentleman down the back here that has been trying.

Yenzure: I'm from the tourism association for Mundaring, mine doesn't relate to the voting so if you want to get that out of the way first I can get onto mine afterwards.

Colin: Just a quick comment then down the back.

Unknown... It doesn't pre-empt the properties around her from selling at a later date, it just gets it off the agenda for the site of the water treatment plant. Could we at least have a quick show of hands, just to get an idea of support or to give us some idea of when we are making criteria of how the land lies?

Colin: You are asking for a show of hands on what issue?

Unknown: The lady to have some reassurance if you like, even an informal show of hands on how the public feels about site four. Knowing that if people want to sell from other areas in site four to Water Corp in the future they can. But as you know they have a policy of buying properties in the catchment anyway.

Colin: Well I don't.

Unknown: But the Water Corp does. It doesn't pre-empt The Water Corp. from buying land around by us taking it off.

Colin: I'm hesitate about having a show of hands, I think what is more important is the issue be resolved effectively and transparently and think the point Sharon has made that some opportunity for the participants to indicate their vote on the issue done in writing seems to be an option and I guess I'm suggesting that is an option so we can move forward. I don't want to diminish the significance of this issue because I think it is fundamentally critical.

Unknown: Just as long as people realize it doesn't pre-empt The Water Corp. from buying the land out of the catchment. As this gentleman was saying if the other owners want to sell they can still sell, even if we took it off the agenda as a site for the water treatment plant. So it's not pre-empting anything for the land owners that aren't here that might want to sell. It just means we are just taking it off the agenda.

Colin: Yes Fiona, just quickly.

Fiona... That map is our property that is why I want to clarify. That map is exactly our property. There is a little left off our property but its part lot one and part of lot two.

Colin: I'm just aware of time, what I'm suggesting that the opportunity to vote on this issue will be made available for all the people who has registered what I need to do is make sure the precise wording of that is accurate and I guess what I'm going to suggest is that there is a group of thirteen people that have been advising me, I guess I need to make sure that the issue that people have been asked to register a vote on is defined clearly and I would like to have the opportunity to do that with that group of people, if that is acceptable to you. Thank-you Fiona for raising that. I do want to acknowledge that it seems to me that it is a very critical question to get it resolved transparently and quickly. Can we suggest we move onto other questions?

Sharon: In which I'm going to do, is everyone alright with that? I have several questions for the reserve protection zone. Sorry I didn't get the names down. I want to make an observation first of all, while I applaud them for having a 2km protection zone, I did note that that is a greater protection zone then there is for people. What I want to know is when you approached the Mundaring shire regarding the DWSP consultation.

Steve: Drinking water source protection plants have been to the hills shires at various times over the last twelve months, the shire offers a level for informal comments it may haven't come to council yet and what will happen is those plans will come through to the full council and will be in full consult with the community before we put them together. We have an assessment document being prepared, I think in-fact Mundaring is a carry over from a couple of years ago in form of a draft plan but nothing is set in concrete on it. The reservoir protection zones do have legislative purpose and 2km is something that is established in legislation.

Sharon: Thank-you, carrying on from that, does that 2km protection zone includes priority two and priority three catchments.

Steve: The priority of catchments one, two and three is a continuation of that reservoir you can't think of them as an overlay like in a planning system. You have priority one, two and three within a catchment and then you have a reservoir protection zone that can sit over the top of that. So you will still have for example, you could have a priority one area in a reservoir protection zone; you can also have a priority two in a reservoir protection zone.

Sharon: You aren't answering my question. Does this also cover priority two and three catchment areas? That's all I'm asking.

Steve: There is no such thing as priority two and three catchment areas.

Sharon: Ok, if the 2km homes, if it becomes a priority two and three among priority one that's included. Are you looking at all catchments for future water supplies?

Steve: You can define a catchment as a physical area for its surface water. Within that physical area of catchment the rainfall in it is going to make its way to the dam anywhere in that physical catchment you can create a priority one, two and three area or mix of one, two and three. Immediately where the dam is you have a reservoir protection zone as well. So there is a combination of approaches, there not one or the other. That's clearly what we go through in the source protection plan, hopefully that made it that little bit clearer.

Sharon: Now on the risk management I have been asking for this over and over, I need a complete list of the chemicals that are being proposed to be used in the water treatment. We have been given a list that said these are some of the chemicals. I happen to know some that I'm not going to name right now that are also used that are never listed. You keep talking about chlorine. You always talking about chlorine, what about the rest? So I would like that answer, not right now, but I have been asking since the first forum and I haven't had an answer. I would also like to make another statement. The fatality risk, which is interesting, is the same as for a nuclear power plant; wind scale has 1×10 to the -6 , anyway on that one. Ok on the indigenous, this is my last question.

Colin: Sorry Sharon can I just ask? The answers that were provided to you on the chemicals don't address.

Sharon: No they don't. Because I have done my own research and they aren't all inclusive and some of them are quite volatile in sunlight and different things transport etc. I do have a science degree so don't be afraid to send me the stuff. Now on the questions which were lost, which is the indigenous one, it has been misrepresented again. The question reads why has the appropriate process not been followed? We were told the aboriginal people would be consulted, why haven't they been consulted? Why do the maps not include significant information on indigenous heritage sites? That's not what I asked. I know the law on the proper consultation, but we were assured at the very beginning of these meetings that the indigenous people would be consulted at the beginning then at the end as they usually are, it's the tail wagging the dog, so that section 18 can be passed by the minister then they can do what they want anyway. It's almost faded completely when the indigenous people are finally consulted. We were assured that on the environmental issue and the indigenous issue they would be involved on the consultation from the beginning. The only action Water Corp. took was to send a letter to the elders stating that they could come along to these

consultations. Now I'm sure Mr. Yerun will agree with me that these are completely unacceptable and I was expecting on-going consultation throughout this process. Not them being guests like us, there then not being properly culturally consulted and it hasn't happened. So I just want to ear mark that. I'm not asking for an answer right now but I would like that to be considered.

Colin: Reg would you like to respond now? No. Yenzure then we will come down the front here.

Jens: On a lighter note I have a question for Robert. Is it possible to show in your presentation of the view from North and South ledge? From a recreation point of view those two areas are important, above the weir wall on the other side and I noticed that you haven't actually made a presentation. The north letch is partly developed by CALM as a viewing platform of the weir area and the south letch is a fully developed by the shire of Kalamunda which are used extensively by the tourists. I think that it would be good to have a view from those two areas.

Robert: I think that that is a good point. I have been thinking about actually locating a camera and looking at the proposed site to see how we can see it from the north and the south letch. We can actually do a bit more than that. We can see and create a view where the terrain might actually obstruct the view or you might even present an open view and if that is possible we will develop a view from those two key points.

Jens: I know have a question for Steve about the Middle Helena Dam protection zone.

Steve: The Middle Helena department of land use and water management strategy does have a protection zone identified down at the pump back that was part of a community consultation process that occurred. I believe that the shire and Department of Planning and Infrastructure are finalizing the document on the Middle Helena land use and water management strategy and it does have a protection zone and the priority areas are identified throughout that whole catchment.

Jens: What I'm looking at are the two areas below the dam. One kilometer away from the dam itself.

Steve: That would not be within the protection zone because it's too far away because it's more than two kilometers away from the Middle Helena and the pump-back. It would be in a priority area of that catchment, but not within a protection zone which has to be within 2km from the high level of the water body/storage body.

Yenzure: Considering a lot of the water goes down to that lower pipe and comes from that area.

Steve: That's why we have priority one, two and three areas, it looks after areas outside the protection zone so it's not forgotten about, but it's managed by a priority area system not a protection zone system. It sounds like I might need to come back if people want a better idea about what priority areas and protection zones. If you want to do your own reading and research we certainly have a website that goes through and describes the how we approach the drinking water catchment protection issue.

Colin: Just going back to Sharon's question to Reg. Reg if we could, I know you might talk about that with Sharon, but we might need to get the response as well and just circulate that in the questions so other people can see that. You don't need to do that now; I'm just thinking if we can get that written, then we will send it out to people. We will go to Paul now, and then we will come down here.

Paul: I just want to ask about the fatality risk criteria, I just want to know what the distance is. You are saying one person in a million years, what's the distance?

Unknown: The exact distance depends on the quantity of the spillage. It also depends on the terrain as well. Can you answer that one?

Steve: We have over two hundred chlorine sites for the state, we have had to over the past fourteen years take risk assessments for a whole range of those sites, so for the Mundaring site we've look at the possible chlorine consumption rates and we have a series of risk assessments which rarely well match up with that site, which give a distance of about 250 meters to about 300 meters tops. So that's the sort of distance we are talking about for the 1 million criteria. That independent site, because that's purely based on chlorine consumption. I'm saying that could be three hundred because depending what the terrain formations are it can accentuate risk contours in certain directions.

Paul: Just one more question. About the high water mark in the reserve, the 2 kilometer, I got a bit confused because in your map it shows you have the north side and the south side and that's all hill area and the high water mark will never get to the top of.

Steve: No, the 2km when you think of it when it's full point when it starts to come over the spill way, the water obviously settles back behind the dam. Where that water settles and stops you start measuring your 2 kilometers from that point back into the catchment. So that is what the 2 kilometers represents. So it's from the point when the dam is absolutely full, you put your tape measure there and then you say now I'm going to go 2 kilometers down into the catchment and in that area that is the 2 kilometer protection zone. Then we say it also include the body of water itself, because there is no point protecting the land around the water body if you don't protect the water body itself. So the water body and the land in those 2 kilometers is part of the water body protection zone.

Colin: Ok I will just take three more questions and that will be it.

Unknown: This question is to Steve as well. The pine plantation and the CALM land as sites do they fall within the 2 kilometer or outside 2 kilometer?

Steve: Look at the aerial; I'm not overly familiar with the Mundaring catchment, those sites look to be pre-existing land uses in the same way that there may be private property that came forward in the reservoir protection zone that we need to recognize and unless I have some money to shake free so I can purchase land, very similar to Water Corporation, but its not Water Corporation it's the Department of Water, within reservoir protection zones if I could find some way of improving the quality of water by relocating activities in there, we wouldn't normally approve based on today's policies, then I would try and do that. But at this point in time they are pre-established uses and they are recognized as acceptable uses in that context. It's the same as land owners, we won't be asking

people to leave although I might come and knock on your door and say are you interested in selling. Willing seller, willing buyer, if you're not interested I walk away.

Colin: There is one here and then one just behind Steve, then we will finish.

Mike : If I heard you correctly earlier Colin did you say that GHD would be conducting an environmental survey.

Colin: What I think they are doing is a flora and fauna survey due to commence any time now, Megan do you want to comment on that? And I'm not sure do you want a comment on how many and how many sites? That information will become available at later consideration at this point.

Mike: It just seems a little odd, GHD obviously have a commercial relationship with the Water Corporation it wouldn't seem to me that they are the most appropriate choice for an environmental survey. Wouldn't it be better to have an independent survey? We have an history in Western Australia, as I know from my own experience of surveys that tend to come up with appropriate answers, I wouldn't be happy personally, I don't know how everyone else feels that someone in that relationship is doing an environmental sound. Any comments?

Colin: Any comments?

Unknown: Essentially most of the consultants do work for The Water Corp. at some point in time; we would have difficulty finding someone who hasn't done work for the Water Corporation.

Megan: One, we don't actually have a site in mind. There are no pre-conceived ideas at all. Two, it's myself and another who will go out and do that and I assure you we don't have any influence from The Water Corp. at all in any way. We present what we find. That's all I can give you of my own personal assurance.

Colin: OK there was a question just here. We will finish the questions after this one, and I would ask you to raise any others at the syndicate group. I'm just mindful of time. So the last question here.

Unknown: I was just curious with the reservoir protection zone which sites are within that?

Unknown 2: The one that is definitely in it is the CALM airstrip site, shown on the maps that you have at your table. Certainly as far as reservoir protection zone sites, but not by number, the airport CALM airstrip. There is a small portion on the CALM depot land; however that is a small portion that we can engineer out of the RPZ anyway with a drainage pattern and the site 2, which is a picnic area above the dam, quite a portion of that is on the catchment of the reservoir itself. Now Megan is that all, yes.

Colin: I'm just aware of time; I know there was another question here but if you could just raise those questions with the people specifically. What we are going to do now is basically is work in the small syndicate groups through till about 9 o'clock. There are essentially two tasks for the syndicate groups. Next forum GHD, the risk management people will be back and their wanting to get some clearer picture for the concerns you have and the questions about potential hazards.

Some of them may be chemical some of them may be not. So the first question the syndicate group will address will be after what you have heard tonight what specific concerns do you have regarding potential hazards associated with the proposed plan? This is simply a first go to get some information to enable GHD to come back and talk further. The second question for the syndicate group these are in your workbooks and the syndicate group facilitators we would like to see if there is an agreement to use those essential criteria to narrow the sites down, not tonight, but at later forums to a smaller number for more detailed investigation. We won't be doing the narrowing down tonight, but what we do want to see is on your tables is a summary of the essential and the important criteria addressed last forum. We're interested in knowing whether you agree to use those to narrow the sites down to a smaller number. The facilitators have those task, they are also in your workbook. Feel free to take a couple of minutes to get a tea and coffee and something to eat. If you have any questions feel free to direct them to someone to answer them.

(Meeting Break and syndicate group discussions)

Colin...Just to give us a very quick one or two minute summary about essential criteria as identified by the group. The material will come back to you as another summary of tonight's work, so you will get it back in that form with a bit more detail. But it will be helpful to just get a quick summary from each of the facilitators about the group's discussion, about criteria. Brendan, do you want to start down the back very quickly?

Brendan: Thanks Colin, I will be very brief, ours is very quick. This group decided the criteria as it sits here they were pretty happy with most of that, although it then became obvious that it was a meaningless task for the group to look at the criteria further because they really want to see all the sites and apply the criteria to each site. So that becomes a new criteria for this group. The criteria being that we see all of the sites before trying to apply any of the criteria to them. Secondly they would then like to see what a simulated model would look like on each of the sites. The third point this group made is simply that the two dates that you have for going to see the sites should include seeing every site, not just a few sites. Even if that means extending the time from 12 to 2 o'clock if that should be the case. This group really felt it wasn't a useful use of their time to come back here next month without having seen every site and then being able to apply the criteria to having seen the simulated model, similar to what we have seen tonight.

Colin: I think one of the concerns we had about that was private property. That clearly is an issue. That's why the suggestion was those sites that are government land, but maybe that is an issue the corporation can take on. Ken I don't want to put you on the spot now, but I take the point, and certainly the plan was that those things was to visit the site and to have more site specific information would be made available to you before we begin to apply those criteria. So we should be able to address those criteria as well. Thanks for that. Now we will just go over to Kerring down the back.

Kerry: Our group again were fairly happy with the criteria, there was a couple of individual comments from our group that gave a couple of applauses for The Water Corp. they were that the environment criteria was fairly comprehensive and they were very impressed to see the seasonal survey of the vegetation in the different areas.

Colin: Can I just comment there that those criteria were your work, that's a summary of the work that your group did. The Corporation's work is none of that, they might have agreed with that I don't know, but it is the work of the syndicate group summarized.

Kerry: One addition to the conditions to the safety of residents was that taken into account the size of the fault lines of the scarp to be addressed in the safety elements. Then we spent more times perhaps on the last criteria because they actually had been identified as being essential or important or anything like that. So we felt that number six, the social impact, a lot of the issues covered in number nine, heritage and cultural impact, were actually just more specific elements of the same thing. Our group actually felt that number six and number nine could pretty much be combined. Then one person...

(End of Tape One)

Kerry... that no compulsory acquisition of private property should become an essential criteria. But other members felt that if another site met all the criteria it still needed to be included to be looked at further. There was an individual view that someone felt. Number eight in regards to the national parks that that could almost be an in-between important and essential because it almost could be highly important as a category. It was a bit more than important but not essential. I think that is about it.

Colin: Thank-you. I think you will find, I saw heads nodding, I suspect there is some consistency in groups with those views. OK Sarah.

Sarah: Our group agreed with the approach to use essential criteria to shorten the list, with the idea that any eliminated from the process we need to be reported back why they were eliminated it's all a transparent process. Agreed to those who were essential now and also had a few comments about the ranking of some of the criteria. Number six, social impact, wasn't clear to our group how number six was different from number three, which was the amenity impact. We felt that could have been combined. Number seven, private property we had quite a discussion there, we were split 50/50 whether that was essential or important criteria. Number eight the group felt that national park land should be essential criteria. In regards to number nine, heritage and cultural impact the group felt that this should be site specific, it could be essential for certain sites in terms of the cultural impact and it could be less important for other sites. Number ten community monitoring process, that was unclear to the group what that meant, it doesn't appear to this group to be a criteria more part of the process. Number eleven security and terrorist's impact didn't feel this would be legitimate selection criteria because it poses nearly the identical risk for each site. There was one participate however that did feel this was an important criteria. Didn't understand number twelve, we need to clarify what time is being referred to, is that construction time, I think it was a bit vague. That's the end.

Colin: Karen if you can just give a picture of the essential criteria if you can.

Karen: Our group agreed to use the criteria to narrow down the sites. The key areas, given that a few areas were addressed in the criteria, were relating to point three. There was concern that the word to be decided participants or residents, felt the decision could not be made by participants only agreed to as any other decision

may be based on emotion rather than logic. In regards to point three limiting visual impact, they felt that all areas should be screened as much as possible from tourist sites. Point three, economical and financial consideration should be given essential ranking, this relate stems from there needs to be a balance in equal consideration at all costs including environment, financial, social heritage. Finally they felt that national parks should be excluded or any area that could potential become a tourist interest in the future.

Colin: Thank-you.

Unknown: Our group spent quite a bit of time seeking clarification from different people in the room from GHD, DIW, The Water Corp. and also Colin. Essentially agreed to use the criteria as long as it excludes private property which is echoed on other tables. They also wanted to be reassured that they could add criteria as more information came to hand about particular sites and that was reassured by Colin. There were questions around the risks to do with chemicals and warning systems and communications and procedures that we have detailed to pass on.

Colin: Thank-you, Krista. Sorry to be speeding it up, I just want to be finished by 9.30pm.

Krista: This group thinks the issue of private land is an essential criteria and needs to be settled first before anything goes any further. Some decisions need to be made and this group should have the authority to make decision, after all all registered people have been advised that a decision would be made perhaps at the next forum. Applying the criteria first then looking at the private land issue after, seems to be the process back the front. A statement needs to be made clearly once again by the Water Corporation that private land won't be resumed. The Water Corporation needs to identify these sites and work out if the water treatment plant will fit on any of these sites if they will sell, if not just eliminate these sites once and all, and to be done this by the next forum. In other words, to approach any potential land owners and to see whether any of these sites is actually viable. Instead of saying they can't eliminate because someone else might sell, they want all land owners approached and to see if they will sell and if the treatment plant can be fitted on those sites. This group will then agree to apply the essential criteria to narrow the remaining sites down, all essential criteria equally considered, no ranking or any order and a smaller list of sites to be established then looking in more detail at the criteria when you have about four or five left. Also as well as considering the issue of private land and again prior to applying this essential criteria, The Water Corporation identify the sites, that they come forward and say they are not economically viable and that these are also eliminated before a lot of time is wasted looking at whether they're suitable. Basically that is what this group decided.

Colin: Thank-you Krista, Leah.

Leah: I don't have a whole lot to add, our group was concerned with the issue of private property resumption. There is not a lot to add to what was said, other then under point one given the lack of resolution with the private property issue the group didn't feel they could take the sub-criteria under number one regarding the use of degraded and cleared sites at face value. There was a query in regards to criteria three, whether it was practicable that a plant could be made invisible and whether that particular point should be made desirable rather than essential criteria. Under

criteria number four the feeling was that the resident amenity should take precedence over infrastructural consideration. Under point seven it was felt that sub-criteria numbers one and two should be made essential rather than important. Those are the ones that regard acquisition of land. Finally on point eight there was general agreement that national park site assessment should be made on a merit basis for each individual site and not excluded simply because it's a national park.

Colin: Thank-you very much, I'm just aware of time. Just a couple of announcements clearly considerable work that you have done and I think you will get a picture that there are clearly areas of agreement about the criteria. There are still areas of not so much disagreement but where there are alternatives used and I will present this information back to you for further consideration. Now for the next forum the plan is that there will be a lot more sites specific information that will be provided to you to enable us to start to look down to some of those sites in a bit more detail. There will also be the site visits and those of you who haven't filled in the form if you can fill that in to let Steve McKenzie know that you intend to participate. There are also another couple of things happening in September, Megan mentioned the Fauna and Flora survey, and so hopefully at the September forum we will be focusing on a lot more site specific information to enable us to then start beginning to talk about applying those criteria to sites. The one thing I should mention to you is we normally we give you a couple of alternatives for the next meeting the problem this time round is school holidays plus some council meetings and we have a problem in that there only is the availability of some key people that will be speaking at the forum, so we normally give a couple of options, but this time we do have to set the next forum for the 25th of September, for the reason of school holidays are the end of that week, the previous Monday we have a couple of key people unavailable plus there is Mundaring shire council business. That makes it difficult for some people to attend so we had to make that decision about the 25th. I apologize for that, but it was just a case of needing to lock in some people. There is a number of things I need to resolve, particularly this issue that came up earlier, I will be meeting with that small group of people, there is about thirteen or fourteen that nominated their interest and I anticipate that information will come out to you plus other participates about that. Plus you will receive the transcript of the forum and a revised version of the criteria that incorporates our discussion tonight. Perhaps I should explain, what I do there is I simply summarize the groups work. I don't add any text and the corporation doesn't add any text. It is a summary of what I make of the groups discussion, so that will come back to you prior to next months forum. Can I thank-you very much again, it is a great pleasure to work with you in such a way where people are committed to work through this process. Thank-you for your time, thank-you for your energy, thank-you for your commitment and sorry we are five minutes over time and travel safely home. Thank-you. Can I also ask that the workbooks come back? They are critical in structuring the next forum.

