

The Water Corporation Mundaring Deliberative Forum

Forum 5- 25th of September 2006

[Opening of Meeting]

Presentation-

Colin Penter- Thank-you for your patients, we had the karate group here before so we didn't have a lot of time to set up, so thank-you for your patients. For those who are football followers I guess you either commiserate or appreciate, and for those of us who are happy it's over in a week, we only have a week to go. For those of you who don't know, my name is Colin Penter and I'm the independent facilitator for this process. So that means I'm contracted by The Water Corporation but not part of The Water Corporation. Now a couple of things to provide you with some background about what has happened since the last forum. Thank-you to those who filled in the workbooks which were analyzed and are available on the website; and have also been used to plan this forum. Thirty-five people some of you here would of attended the two site visits that The Water Corporation organized. I think there were about twenty-five people then about nine that came in on the weekend. I met with members of the advisory group and in fact some of the speakers tonight were discussed and suggested by that group so I thank them for their feedback.

You would have received a number of documents which were sent out to the two hundred and twenty people who registered. Those documents were a progress report from me primarily for people so they could at least get a perspective on the process. There was detail from The Water Corporation about sites. Those of you who went on the site visits would have received that information as well. There are hard copies of that document here tonight as well if people need them. The other information you were sent was the draft list of criteria that was developed at these last two forums.

The other thing that has been happening is that GHD have begun their spring Flora and Fauna survey. Megan who is here tonight, many of you have met, has been doing that. I understand we will probably hear more about that at the October forum. That is still on-going.

I should record a couple of apologies. There is an apology from MLA Jay Radersitch, an apology from councilors Sharon Davies and an apology from Neil and Bev McClain.

Hopefully tonight we wish to do a couple of things. We want to try and endorse the criteria developed this forum, so that we can use that to narrow the longer list of sites down at the October forum. I will be asking in the workbooks and the syndicate groups for individuals to indicate your ranking of those criteria. It's not to say that there aren't other criteria that will be considered, but they're the criteria that have been developed so far. You will see hopefully as part of that criteria we will be able to address the issue of private property that has been an issue of concern.

Also tonight there will be three presentations. The purpose of those is really to provide you with some more information to assist us in the next stage of the process which will be about trying to apply the criteria to narrow sites down and then to analyze those sites in a bit more detail which will be the work of the October and November forum. One speaker is Miles Harmon, who is a resident and a participant in this forum. Miles presented some of his ideas to the small advisory group and the suggestion was made that he would present those tonight. You have a handout on your seat of some information from Miles. Miles is very clear about saying this is a personal view and he's just offering it to the forum. The second speaker will be Ken Walter with assistance from Robert Ng from The Water Corp, who will continue with the 3D simulation and Ken will also talk about the sites in a bit more detail and some of The Water Corporation's preferences in terms of those sites. The third speaker is a very distinguished speaker which I would like to record my appreciation for his attendance that was facilitated by some of the members of this group; that is a very distinguished Western Australian Professor Bolton that many of you will know is one of the states most distinguished historian. He has been asked to speak by some of the participants on issues of heritage and historical issues so Geoffrey will follow Ken's presentation.

The other thing that we will do in the syndicate group is in one of the earlier forum, The Water Corporation outlined what it thought its possible criteria were. You have an A3 diagram on your table that compares The Water Corporation's proposed criteria with the proposed criteria that has come out of this forum and the syndicate group facilitators will explain that to you further down the track. But that simply tries to contrast the criteria suggested by The Water Corporation for narrowing sites down and those that were developed by this forum.

The other thing I should say was that it was advertised that a speaker from GHD would address the issue of hazards that you raised last forum. The GHD personnel will be presenting on those issues at later forums to describe how those concerns will be addressed and managed at particular sites. So it was a combination of wanting to make that information more specific to sites and also the need to limit the number of speakers to three this forum. So GHD will speak on hazards at a later forum.

So I will step out of the way and hand over to Miles who is going to start off with his thoughts. Miles is a participant in this forum, a resident. Miles had presented these ideas to the community advisory group that I met with and the suggestion was made that he present those to this forum as a personal view for your consideration. It is being clearly presented as a personal view for your consideration. Miles will clearly be here during the forum there will be opportunities for questions, you may want to ask him questions during the syndicate group as well. I know Miles has put a lot of time and effort into this so thank-you and I will hand over to him.

Myles Harmon: I noticed you said three times it was my personal view, it's like everyone is trying to disown me or something. I also noticed we have two very distinguished speakers this evening and I'm not one of them it seems, fair enough. Anyway, I have this document here; this is the one I'm talking to. Now what I'm going to do is just talk about that document. I'm going to go through this quadruple underline, this big picture view to start off with, just talk a little bit about that. Then how we go from that through to working out what our priorities are and that intermediate

stage I have one way of doing it. The Water Corporation have a similar type of way and I'm not going against anything here I'm just presenting a slightly different way of going from a requirements, our quadruple underlining, through to actually working out the criteria and the priorities. Then I'm going to talk a little bit about that, and then you will know the angle I'm coming from. If you're not that interested you might want to work out exactly where I'm going just out of curiosity because I have some clues in there for you. I will then come up with my suggestion and talk a little bit about my suggestion. Then I will match what I'm going to suggest to what I said earlier on.

So what we have got is this broad picture, this broad idea that I think we all have to stick to, in this case social environment, economic and cultural. There is one missing out of here, but same idea. We have to try and keep a big picture and try and not get to get to obsessed with little details of our particular angle. From going down from that big thing to trying to sort the priorities out I found that a bit difficult so what I did was I deconstructed those four things and tried to work out what values I thought needed to be applied to try and work out the priorities. So that was my intermediate step. I will just talk you through those, the reason I will talk you through those is because that will help you to see where I'm coming from and help to answer your questions in anticipation.

First of all one thing that I value, and I'm sure everyone shares these values pretty much, safety. I value safe drinking water. It worries me that the people of Kalgoolie have to have three injections of Chlorine which gets knocked out by organic material before it gets to Kalgoolie. That's not a good situation. I'm concerned that the workers working at this plant are safe, I'm concerned about the people that visit this plant are safe and I'm concerned that the residence that live in this area are safe.

I'm a kind of landscape person, that's my thing. I've just missed a couple of your meetings because I've been over in Tibet walking around. I like mountains, I like walking around. I value a landscape. I have a lovely picture of a landscape in china, huge mountains, it's got a waste paper bin in it, and it kind of spoils it. I like a pure landscape. We have some wonderful landscapes here in Western Australia. Helena Valley incidentally is one of them. That's a recreational aspect to that, I value the environment. Particularly Western Australian environment, I value our native flora and fauna. If I had my way, which isn't going to happen 80% of Western Australia would be returned to what it was like two hundred years ago. I value the environment it is important, but sometimes you have to do a bit of trading in that.

Now those things are mostly covered in here, now we are going to get a bit of an idea of where I'm at. I value education; I spent thirty years in education more or less. What we are talking about here is water, which is the most vital source in Western Australia. If you haven't got the water for the people you are a bit stuck. People need to know about water, they need to be educated about it. I told a friend of mine about what was going on and he checked out the website and he was amazed about how open this process was being. This is brilliant the fact that we can stand up and speak, but I want that openness to continue when the plant is built. Lastly inclusively, I include in my thinking people that aren't here now. That includes people that are not here because they are somewhere else and people that are not now because their time hasn't come yet because they are fifty to a hundred years in the future. So I include those people and you could add

other things. I value good design for example. So they are the general values I think need to be applied and I'm sure most of you would share some common ground with me there. That is what this document here is about; similar common ground.

Now I come to consider the water treatment plant. I think there are a lot of assumptions we have had about this plant. The meetings I have come to have been very negative. Like we don't want here, we don't want it on this ground, we don't want the roads going to it, we are worried about the fauna and flora etc. So it's been a bit negative in my opinion. We are worried about the safety, we are worried about the environment fair enough and I take all those things on board. But I think what we can do is turn this plant from being a liability to being an asset. You can turn it from a problem to a solution if you like. I think we are being a bit wussy about the whole thing; we should make the best of this and think positively about it we can actually get a quite good outcome for everybody. That is my thing. My thing is that the plant should be open to the public, OK now you are going to say there are safety issues and I will talk about them later. I think this is an opportunity to put your different hats on and think about this in a different kind of way and see what comes out. People in the Midland rail yards said it was an eye soar and they're going to pull them down, they're an asset now. The docks in Melbourne were a problem. I used to live in London and the docks in London who would go near the docks in London! So I think if you get good design and creative people thinking, if you sent it to UWA students as a design project you would be amazed at the possible solutions people come up with. So like I said lets get positive about it.

Now up there we have the hills activity center. I don't know if anyone has been there, it's like four little houses and they get one hundred students a day going through there. If you make this into a public facility, you get an educational aspect to it and it fits in with the other buildings that are there, the weir, the lake etc you could make something out of it. This is history in the making. When O'Connor went and put the weir up people would have said, 'you can't put 200meters of concrete up in this valley,' yes people would have said that. The reality is that is what people go and see now. They actually go and look at the weir, that concrete wall they actually go and look at the lake which is artificial. That is where people congregate. We are going to build something that is artificial and in one hundred years time that will be history. Let's be positive about it. That is my thing. I'm suggesting that this treatment plant be open to the public and we should make as positive as decision about it as we can.

Now let's go back and actually talk about the things I've talked about. The safety aspects, in one sense the safety and assess are in opposite directions aren't they. If someone came to you and said 'I want to build a tank about one hundred meters long and I want to put sharks in it and rays and things like that. Then we are going to get people to walk through it.' Does anyone know what I'm talking about? The aquarium yes! My mum who is ninety-four went through the other day. You put a tunnel under water and there you go. You can find your way around these solutions; I know that there are distances, like chlorine has to be kept away from other things. There are ways around that, you could isolate the chlorine in a separate area, and you could put a bit of reserve out there for native animals, put the chlorine and stuff in there. I think there are ways that the safety issues can be dealt with. No way am I going to suggest that people go in there if it is not safe. But what I am saying think of a way that it can be safe; don't say it

can't be safe. Say 'I can't think of a way now but maybe it can.' The other advantage of it being open to the public is that we can see that it is being run properly. That it is safe.

Landscape! Now if you go and put it in Helena Valley and you stand up the top of North Ledge you will see a lovely valley and you will see a big treatment plant, you would have spoiled that whole landscape; because there is nothing human there at the moment. If you put it somewhere near the weir where there is already human activity its just a bit more human activity. It fits in with the rest. Don't be too embarrassed about it, design it well. Design it so it blends in nicely, design it so as little can be seen as possible, but design it well. It would be nice maybe if it couldn't be seen at all but maybe that's not possible.

The environmental issues, I value the environment, but if The Water Corporation could design it is such a way that it was OK personally I'm supportive of what I call a net positive impact. That's to say if The Water Corporation takes twenty-five hectares of bush and at the same time they say, I hope you are listening to this Water Corp, 'we have taken twenty-five hectares of bush so we will take two hundred and fifty hectares of farmland and convert it back to bush', I'm going to say 'yes that's a good deal I'm going to go for that.' The other thing about being open up to the public, if you are concerned about the environment and it is open you can go and see what is happening. If it is hidden in the bush how do you know what is happening.

Education! Back to being a fundamental vital resource that people need to know about. There are loads you could do about education, you can go to loads of places, you can go to Mercedes Benz, you can go to beer factories, you can go to chocolate factories, you can go to hydro-electric power stations, you can go to Red hill tip. I went to Red hill tip, I got the bag, I got the hat, and I got the plants and the list of plants and the photos. It's an interesting thing to do to actually go and find out what is happening in these places. I think the water treatment plant could be a good place to go and see. I could go on for ages, as a teacher, about all the sorts of things you could do there to make it interesting. I would say from a safety point of view that I would two levels of visit. An unsupervised level of visit, that would go to reception area and museum area where all the models and all the videos where. So that is quite clearly an unsupervised area, as unsupervised by The Water Corporation. Then you would have the supervised, so you would get your hard hat and go around and look at the rest of it. The point is if it is designed like this from the beginning then that will affect the design of the plant. If you design it from the beginning thinking 'this is going to be opened to the public, people are probably going to be walking around, they are going to want to see all these exhibits,' then the two things go together. If you design it like a treatment plant and then work out afterwards how people are going to see it doesn't work. Every aspect of the plant would have visitor and education and information in mind. You actually design the plant with that in mind

Openness and accountability! Well if you can see it then you can see that your money is being well spent. It is an outlet for The Water Corp to say 'this is what we are doing, this is how we are spending your money, these are the green things we are doing, this is the twenty-five hectares took and this is the two hundred and fifty hectares of farmland that we converted back to bush as a part of a deal. As far as economically concerned it is going to be much cheaper near the existing facilities. You are going to save on capital costs; you are going to

save on running costs. The capital costs could be fed back into making the place interesting for visitors, the running costs could be fed back into running the plant. It is much cheaper if the plant is near the pipeline to run it as well.

Inclusively! You need access for everybody, as in getting in and out. This is an outlet for everybody involved in this process, not just The Water Corporation but environmental groups and other people can put in. I question whether everyone is included. It's strange to me that on here there is no mention of education and still that is my thing. I would say that this is part of our cultural heritage, I would say don't be afraid of this part it's history in the making.

Is there sufficient demand? Well if you design it well, if it is built in conjunction with the weir, with the lake and other facilities and if you do it right then yes, there will be demand. If the centre there can get a hundred people a day, school kids and they have four little houses then I'm sure we can do better than that. What is going to happen to the population of Perth? Well it has gone from two thousand to one and half million in one hundred and fifty years. It has gone up seven hundred and fifty times in two life times. I don't suppose it's going to keep going up quite that fast but it is going to get bigger. A facility like this is going to be a facility for a long time in the future.

Well you were all very quite I hope you were listening.

Colin Penter: Thank-you. Miles has agreed to take some questions now if anyone would like to raise then. We can't afford time to take many; Miles can take other questions later you may want to discuss this issue in the syndicate group. Maybe there are some specific questions we can take right now, so if you just want to pose them at Miles.

(Unknown): Question asked. Not able to be heard.

Miles: I wouldn't necessarily say the offset should be in the locality of the thing. We will not do it; it should be a specific piece of land.

Colin: Any other questions or comments anyone would like to make while Miles is here?

(Unknown1): (Unheard talk)... have a bit of advent garde design effect however many billion it cost to make it would be well worth it because it might enhance the wall.

Miles: Yes ill take that point and I will just say again if you put it in the area where the weir is you will save millions of dollars in capital costs. That money could be spent in making this facility interesting to the public. If it is near the weir you will save money every year on pumping costs because you won't have to pump it to a remote location. That money could be spent on running the public facility. In other words it actually won't cost The Water Corporation anything, because I would not support it being near the weir if it was open to the public. Not that that counts for anything.

(Unknown1)...where tourist can visit without the loss of amenities it's not really very attractive.

Miles: Attractiveness as you all know, we are all married to different people, attractiveness is in the eyes of the beholder and what I'm saying is that the plant might not be attractive but if it is done well and it's put into a kind of discreet

location. I have a site where I think it could go and nobody would see it from the road or the valley. To me the idea of putting a plant in Helena Valley where you look down on it I agree with you that would look ugly.

(Unknown1): I'm just saying don't look at it as an amenity so much that you forget about the fact it will cause some loss of amenities and a lot of the emphasis should be on hiding it or having it where it has least impact on the amenities of the area.

Miles: Yes but I would go back to the point that if you put in an area where there is already human impact you will diminish, you see to me if you stick it out in the bush not only are you using that twenty-five hectares but you spoil the corridor that goes up to it and you have spoiled the land around it, you have some how contaminated the land around it because that is now around something that humans have built. So I say when you look down you not only see that twenty-five hectares it would of contaminated the rest. Does that make sense?

Colin: No other questions for Miles? Miles is a participant he will be in one of the syndicate groups so you may want to post questions of him. Yes, the person down the back.

(Unknown2): Those wetlands that have been created down the causeway are properly a pretty good example how good design can turn a necessary facility into something that is really quite useful and attractive and I really thank you for coming up with these thoughts because I think they are really useful and certainly influenced me, so thank-you.

Colin: Thank-you Miles. I know Miles put a lot of effort and thought into this process. I know not everybody will agree with views he expressed but I think part of this deliberative process has been to try to give the range of views an opportunity to be expressed and it is quite confronting to lay your views out to a large group. Miles thank-you very much for your time and for presenting to the group. So as I said Miles is more than happy to take any questions or disagreements with you later. The second speaker is Ken Walter that many of you will know is the director for site selection for the plant what Ken is going to do is to talk in more detail about the site related information that you have and to work with Roberts 3D simulation. Robert has also asked me to explain that 3D simulation is a bit more detailed it is also available in the syndicate groups if you want to have another look at it there are a couple of people here at other computers so we have got the capacity to show it to you in a bit more detail tonight. So Ken will talk about the sites and also talk about some of the preferred sites from The Water Corporations perspectives. Thank-you Ken.

Ken Walter: Miles I'm going to have a lot of trouble following you I'm sorry but I think there was someone here that was outstanding. I guess a couple of comments on what you did raise there Miles since being confronted by you previously on this subject I have done a little bit of background checking with particularly our planners, which Roberts part of, our environment branch. We have had various representatives, but mainly Suzanne who has just come back to work today and her apologies, she has had a few weeks off with illness so her apologies for not being here tonight. From our designers and our operators the support in general terms was a far lot stronger then I thought they would be. I always thought there would be support and with that input from the community I think we could go a long way. So thank-you for that.

A couple of other comments, you were talking about process of deciding and running choice, of technology, openness and accountability. One thing that I have been involved in for quite a few years now since 1994 was the government sewage program. In 1995 we started a new part of our business that we called resident reference groups where we do surveys like we normally do but we have normally about half a dozen people that join us once every two or three months to keep getting informed and keep giving information backwards and forwards. That is now very much part of our business and it certainly once we get down the track to where Robert is going to start taking over from me I would expect that that sort of process will continue. You are 80% of WA I love it. If you want to see me later on I'm working for two voluntary organizations The Australian Wildlife Conservatory and The Australian Bush Heritage fund. So if you want to put some energy into that see me after and I will get you a membership form. That's where I've been last week, I've been up there looking at that issue there Miles and I might grab you after and tell you about it.

What I'm going to talk about is really based on this handout which you have a copy there today. Which were handed out on the site inspections on the Wednesday and the Saturday? Now just to show how much detail I have to go, can I please have a show of hands of who did not attend either of those two sites visits? OK so ill go into it within some detail. Now Robert and I have talk about it here today and I don't quite know what Robert has got up on this. It starts site one and moving around that. I don't intend to go through every one of the dot points but I certainly can raise a few issues. Coming from a base point of view with The Water Corporation this is one of the two initial sites considered but was rejected by government. It was rejected by government because of the heritage and tourist issues and the master plan of the Mundaring water which was proposed as a heritage tourist precinct. We have convinced the minister that like private land and all the other issues we had to go back, like some people suggested, and consider all. I have some serious doubt whether we can get approval to go to that site. The issues are obviously the heritage and tourism issue as people have been saying we love it, from The Water Corps point of view we love it because it's the cheapest spot its right below the weir, it's where a treatment plant should be. From the economic and technical features; if you look to the far right of that spreadsheet the estimated cost is one hundred and twenty-five million and I can assure you my treasury people love that. The operators love it, it's directly below the dam, there are issues like it is not big enough as well and if we went there we would have to put the sludge drying beds somewhere on the south side of the river. It is shown at the moment on the maps that you have in the national park area. That could go further south and higher into a pine plantation which is outside the national park. There are issues with that as well and particularly with the green house effect with all the pumping, the extra distance you have to put a pipe to get to it and all those sorts of things. If we keep going in the right order, so I guess on summary the first one The Water Corp I believe would have trouble getting site one because of the heritage tourism total master plan and also the potential of the drying beds being in the national park. If that is one of the preferred sites in your community groups then I will assure you then I will go through the process and try and get it.

The next one is the Kilometer one below the weir. Again it is set out there with environmental features, social features and the economic features yet again from our point of view, The Water Corps point of view ideal sort of site, it is adjacent to

the pipelines, and it's relatively cheap in capital costs. Relatively cheap in operating costs, although the operating costs don't change all that much over the different sites until we get a fair way away from the pipeline. As I said it's in the normal practice of the lower dam wall, below the major source wall. It is in the national park, I don't believe we will get it. Those who went on the site tour it's a pretty pristine part of our country when compared with other areas that people believe are pristine. It is virtually out of site from South Ledge it is suitable from North Ledge, but if we are talking about putting a road way a kilometer down the valley and also pipelines which connect the existing pipelines on the north side, across the river and down the valley further to the site we are going to make quite a bit of mess there. I don't think I could convince two houses of parliament at this government level or at any future government level for this particular part of the national park. We started looking at this because we had that query about Pauls Valley and I asked Robert to look at Pauls Valley, but if you go down towards it you are going further and further away from the dam and our operating and capital costs are much higher. In summary Robert would love it from an engineering point of view, but I think he would hate it for a lot of the other issues and being a national park I think we have a problem.

Site two if you look at your maps, I will leave the speaker for a while. (Unheard talking.) It is a very tight site particularly if we are going to minimize going into the national park and coming back into the disturbed area which is a picnic area. I've been informed informally it would have a chance of being able to take over the picnic area and rose garden and all those sorts of things. But more to the point it is in national park and to make matters worse it's in the RPZ which is in a reservoir protection zone we spoke about last week. I don't believe we would get two houses of parliament to agree to that national park there and I think we would have an enormous amount of problem from The Department of Water who made a presentation to you people last week and even though I'm talking about one hundred and forty-three million which is in our budget if you would like to call it that way, unlikely. These are comments by the way that are my interpretation of Water Corp design planning issues.

Site three is the private land to the east of the pipeline. As well as being private land it is over dollar cost. If you remember when Peter Moore was here three meetings ago he was a bit reluctant to say anything about dollars eventually it was squeezed one hundred to one hundred and sixty million out of him. That is similar to what I have been saying all along, that I'm prepared to argue with the executives and the government to a figure that I believe is one hundred and fifty to one hundred and fifty-five million. Peter said one hundred and sixty so we will stick to that at this stage. This is one is outside that range, it is directly adjacent to other private property and I'm well aware of what they would try and do to me. However again if you people wish to follow that through I would be obliged to follow it through, it is private property and there is adjacent to private properties. The transport route is down Mundaring weir road and along the McCallum road so there is no real issue with zigzagging down round the weir site. We would require a significant amount of road, telephone, power and water and this one, just correct me if I'm wrong Robert, I believe is a four pipeline two in and two out potential. So we are talking about a suave about thirty to forty meters wide over that whole area, through the RPZ, which is past the Kookaburra heritage and all those sorts of things.

Site four is really on any of that cleared area there anywhere down to McCallum. Now it is private property again and where ever you go on that property you would be adjacent to other land owners. Yes The Water Corporation does own a significant amount of land at the bottom end of that cleared area, but no matter where we go there though we are adjacent to other private land. It is in excess of one hundred and sixty million that Peter indicated that you might consider if he is in a good mood and of course as I said the cost. There isn't necessarily the same destruction to it from clearing native vegetation and those sorts of things. There are ways and most probably the private land down the bottom which is already cleared and people who know it there are patches where you can come through from the pipeline to the edge of private property and things like that yet to anywhere on that cleared land if it was to go there. If it was to go lower

(End of Tape 1, Side 1)

... It would be slightly cheaper, but I don't think we would get that land. If it was to go north of that it would become more expensive. Again I repeat, I don't think we could get that land.

Site five is the Sawyer's Valley hill. It's within the new Mundaring national park. Sawyer's valley we do believe that we could possibly get that excise from national park, in the handouts second reading it's been presented for a national park, it was raised that government may need to exercise it from that national park, because if you remember that was undergoing at the time we started and we did propose that site. I couldn't guarantee that we could get it but there is more of a chance of getting that national park then any other area of national park. It will require clearing of a significant amount of native vegetation which is re-growth but in good condition and the loss of fauna habitat which is on the top of the hill. That is within the Mundaring weir catchment area and will require pipelines to the site which may require some clearing of native vegetation. The cost is within the figure we are talking at about a hundred and forty-seven million. There are lots of good technical reasons it should be there if it isn't going to be below the weir, being on the highest part of the hill, there is already an infrastructure there. The Water Corp does consider the issues associated with that site could be managed, however people still have significant concerns about the lights, the vegetation of course, residents near by and as well and truly pointed out from areas in Sawyer's valley and in Helena Valley you can see the tanks there now so if the treatment plant was going to go there it would also be visible from a considerable area. It is considerably on The Water Corps side, it is within the dollar cost and we believe it could be managed but as I said there are lots of issues. I can hear whispers coming from the floor.

The DEC site which is a CALM site it is within the dollar cost, we believe that any of the issues can be managed, any of the issues can be engineered out of it quite easily and I guess from Miles' presentation it's probably the easiest one to fit into an educational type site. We do have issues that it is owned by someone else besides The Water Corp, it is another government department. Members of government are aware of it, but we received a strong tick by a local member that was before we got to far down the track anyway. Much of the land has been cleared in the past; there are areas of native vegetation north of the site, particularly the Window area and the eastern boundary. It is again within the smaller catchment. Construction cost is not necessarily that cheap because it is a

fairly sloppy patch in areas. The Kookaburra's outdoor cinema is near by. I can solve that problem easy enough if that becomes a problem there is access either from Mundaring Weir road or Allan road. There are issues with the different tracks, the three tracks, you either go through it or are adjacent to it so we have to consider that, you can see it. From engineering point of view it is pretty similar to the two private land sites a cheaper version of those.

(Unknown): Question Unheard

Ken: To answer your question specifically portion of the CALM land, which if you have got the plans there, is the dotted oblong bits on it. A small portion of it is in the RPZ, however we have two options there, we don't go on that piece of land or we can change that catchment area around that corner.

Site seven is Water Corp land it is freehold land off Poison lease road surrounded by state forest and water catchment reserve. It is well outside the dollar cost that I believe I would have any chance of success in doing. That isn't the major issue and the reason why cost is so high is it is a long way from the pipeline and to get four pipes in and out of there and you are going to make a hell of a mess through other land that isn't our land which is pretty pristine forest. We didn't take people there on our site visits but we explained how to get there and I hope some of you would have gone and had a look. That land is probably most equal to the land about a kilometer down stream from the dam, it's pristine and there is pristine land getting to it as well. There is one private property on the top corner of our land, but it is uphill and quite a way away from us. If it was there I don't think there would be any issues that couldn't be managed. It's mainly isolated from residents apart from a private property to the north of the site. Again transport of chemicals and construction traffic and that sort of stuff keeps right out of Mundaring Weir road it comes right up the highway and it goes down Poison Lease road, Coal road a few people there would be affected by that.

The CALM land is a pine plantation most of you know about that one which is down Allan road past the discovery center and Kookaburra cinema. When you are up on South Ledge it is hidden behind a hill. I haven't been to North Ledge but I assume at this stage that it is useable. The pine plantation itself takes up about half the land which we would need, so it would be half pine plantation and half native vegetation once again re-growth, but half native vegetation would go in there. It is just inside our cost figure, I may get objections but I think we could work with that. However it is well and truly within the reservoir protection zone. So we are going to have a lot of problems from another arm of government, being The Department of Water. It will require a new access road; it will require the clearing of native vegetation and other potential impacts. It will make a new pipeline from the weir. The water from it run straight into the reservoir so in particular we would have to have considerable protection work from The Department of Water to even consider it. It is remote from residences. Again if is an issue with the education facilities or kookaburra cinema we could engineer them out and maybe help them more them move, give them better facilities those sorts of things we can do that, but at the present moment we would be passing them all the time. It is removed from the heritage and tourist precinct. It is close to the Bibbulmun track. Transport again would be up Allan road so no different from most of the others. The new pipeline requirement from the weir to the site may impact on some heritage and tourism site, but it is within in our budget and if The Water Corp was to considering it without this involvement

we would certainly be considering it anyway. I think Colin I tried to cut that as short as I can because of our time I'm more than happy to take questions now or unless we wait to after the next presenter.

Colin: I think my suggestion now, we have allocated some time for questions to Ken about any of those specific sites or any of the issues he's raised or any of the information that was contained in the site information you were sent. So I suggest we might take fifteen minutes for questions and then we will get to our third speaker. So any questions of Ken? Yes John.

John: In the site summary information you say that site one was rejected previously by government. Can we have a copy of the government decision on that, quoting the reason of rejection?

Ken: What I do have and what I have supplied previously is a letter from our minister saying The Water Corp would not consider it further that is the only evidence I have that. We have supplied that previously from the minister who at that stage was Nick Griffith I believe, Minister Griffith saying The Water Corp wouldn't consider it further because of the sewage and precinct. The heritage and tourism precinct because it conflicts with the Mundaring Weir master plan which proposes the heritage and tourism precinct, we have supplied the letters before but we can supply it again no problem.

John: Yes I would appreciate that.

Colin: So we will go over here then we will go up the back to Steve McKiernan. So over here.

(Unknown): Because the pine plantation and the CALM land are vertically adjacent to one another is it possible to have the least contaminated parts of the facilities on the pine forest within the RPZ and the rest of it on the CALM land? Can you have a compromise between those two sites so you can overcome the objections to having the pine forest used because its in RPZ, could you just have some of the water treatment plant there, the least contaminating or the least problem parts of the RPZ in the pine forest and the rest of it is the CALM land away from Kookaburra cinema and what ever to have some sort of compromise between the CALM land and the pine plantation so you are addressing the issues of the pine forest being in the reservoir protection zone and CALM land being close to the Kookaburra cinema and areas there?

Ken: I can answer that because we have discussed it many times before. The answer is there is absolutely no reason why we couldn't consider that. I think Robert would be the first to say even that going to the RPZ would be a real issue because we have roads going in and pipelines going in as well, not a as big pipeline of course. It would be the most likely product going to the pine plantation would be the drying beds. Now if the drying beds are there when you look at the maps that are going up it covers a very big area. So you are disturbing a lot of land and convincing The Department of Water that we should be putting drying beds in an area like that would be very difficult. That aside I believe that if you go to the CALM land itself you would be doing far less damage to the environment then you would be going to the CALM site. But certainly it is something I would put on Robert to yes look at that, but I don't think there would be any need to go to the

pine plantation site because there is sufficient land at the CALM depot that is already disturbed.

What is referred to as DEC land up to now because The Department of Environmental and Conservation Zone, I still talk about it as CALM depot land? So that is what we are talking about there. There are two bits of CALM land that we are specifically talking about; one is on the list as DEC land CALM depot and also the pine plantation near the air strip there two specific sites.

Steve McKiernan: Hi Steve McKiernan conservation council. I have got two questions, one is relating to the RPZ. I have attended the Harvey Water forum organized by DOW we are about two hundred and fifty residences and participants attended a forum looking at how Low Brook dam was going to be used now that Low Brook dam was going to supply water to Perth. That involved basically putting an RPZ around a local dam and therefore stopping a whole lot of cultural and social uses of Low Brook which included water skiing and jet skiing etc, kid's camps, adventure camps that sort of thing. Now if The Department of Water can be convinced have multiply use of the reservoir surface itself surely they can be convinced to have multiply use within the RPZ given appropriate safety concerns. I'm just going to put that to you. It was really a question.

My first question then is on the tour we stood at South Ledge and looked over site one over the dam wall and you stated the area needed for the treatment plant was twenty-three to twenty-five hectares isn't that prefigured into a order treatment process, I raised the notion of Harvey dam and how a water treatment plant below Harvey dam wall is going to be able to be fitter into a six hectare site because they intend to use Centra fuses. Could you please give some clarification about why one site compared to Harvey dam which is a quarter of this proposed site in Mundaring?

Ken: Firstly the RPZ I would agree with you quite possibly if I could be two bob each way on that one. If I was the decision maker in The Department of Water about the use in a RPZ my social conscience would be lets make sure appropriate public access. As far as putting a treatment plant there I believe that I could instruct an operator treatment plant in a RPZ but this one is very close to the water as well, its not anything like the two kilometers, its about seven hundred meters from the high water mark. However listening to the presentation from The Department of Water here last forum I got a lot stronger objections to us even being in the RPZ then I was expecting. The chances of getting something in the RPZ more then happy to have a go it's a pretty good site to have a treatment plant. However I don't think I would win that one, I guess that's my reading of the politics.

Steve: Perhaps it then would be a good opportunity therefore to make The Department of Water to enter into these negotiations because personally it just seems that a pine plantation, which are basically are just woody weeds where the conservation council and myself are concerned really we don't need them.

Ken: It's not the issue of a pine plantation it's the activity of within the two kilometers of the top water level.

Steve: And the relative worth and merit of each of the sites.

Ken: I can argue with you either way, I could be with you or against you on that one. The information I have at significant level is the chances of us getting somewhere in the RPZ is pretty difficult, I will make the comment though that if there is no other alternative site then we would have a lot better argument about going to a RPZ than we would have if there are other sites which are potential sites. Same sort of thing with national parks, we have negotiate everything.

The second one was the size of the treatment plant. This treatment plant itself will be the equivalent to the one we have operating in the metropolitan area at the moment. It would make Harvey dam treatment plant insignificant treatment plant in terms of quantity and size is concerned. There are different issues here of water and the way it is done, but on the same basis when you do the analysis centra fuse and alike, mechanical de-watering is a possibility the reports we have from Egus reports is that from an environmental point of view between power and green house effects and those sorts of issues then for this site the drying beds are the best. Now if all of a sudden I'm knocking down unique trees and fauna and flora and things like that it is another consideration. But on the environmental side that is the solar de-watering by drying beds is the best of option. Now we have that report and if you speak to Robert, he has a lot more information of that then I have. So I guess if you want Robert to come and talk about that during the syndicate time we are more then happy.

Colin: One thing I should have pointed out was that the purpose of Ken presenting the corporation's view is that it is the corporation's view and that is not necessarily a view that this forum will agree with in terms of recommendations. What Ken was asked to do was to present The Water Corporations views towards the sites, but there might be an alternative view that you might want to articulate that the corporation would then have to adapt to. So the next question just over here.

Ken: If I can just follow on from that comment mainly because of a few phone calls I've had and also four or five people that I spoke to on the Wednesday tour that in our planning now is the appropriate time to go back and visit a few of the executive views and speak to them again and get a bit more meat of the bone besides from the more technical ones that Robert is supplying about particularly on the dollars and things like that about what chance if I did come up with a radical suggestion?

(Unknown): Ken just one thing and Jeffery Bolton might actually address this you know there are some little heritage timber houses there and I think they are in front of the heritage council, I wouldn't swear but I think they have been proposed as being listed. But my question is I think I understood on our trip to Wanneroo that there are actually two grades of sludge with the myx that one lot of sludge is put out to see and the other sludge drying beds with sediment does this impact on the sort of site we have with the that you actually need one grade that is a bit more toxic if you like and should be kept a bit more further away.

Ken: Can you help me Robert? I'm lost.

Robert: In terms of the sludge there are two basic components that we have to remove from the water, one is the visible turbidity you can see, it is slightly brownish but most times it will be mostly clear. But they are the visible ones we have to remove by some sort of process of coagulation you have to add some chemical called alum to enhance the combining of the combination of the sediment into big flocks so it can settle down quickly. You can clarify and remove it by sedimentation. The

other thing that you can't see is the dissolve organic matter that is clear, it is the one that affects the chlorine residual and they tend to chew up the chlorine very quickly and therefore the chlorine residue doesn't exist in the a very big system like the goldfields. If we remove the organic matter in the water we allow the chlorine to last a longer time and allow it to extend into the long pipelines that have a very long temperature and very long retention time in the pipeline. So basically they are the two things that we remove and when you actually remove them they become the sludge it doesn't really become corrosive or react to anything, you can touch it, it doesn't really harm you.

(Unheard talking)

I think the might they actually truck it to the alfoil and dispose of it. It is basically because of the high salt content they actually use salt to dissolve. Both of them are non toxic.

Ken: I think one of the issues is that people are very concerned about alum which is an aluminum product which over the years about alum being aluminum being aligned to alyssum and alike. So that is an issue that quite a lot of people do bring up always I think the issue in this area is we all know these hills are made of aluminum but the aluminum sludge is truck dried on site then trucked to the Red hill site.

(Unknown): All I wanted to know Ken, would you refresh my memory, didn't I see some sort of treatment plant below the weir was there a small area there that we looked at was there a shed and I don't know, what was that?

Ken: What is below the weir at the present moment, other than a picnic area and a lot of disturb ground and kids playing areas, is also a big green shed which is The Water Corporation's chlorination house. So at the present moment that is one of the chlorine houses which we have got and the system t Mundaring to Kalgoolie. We have a license to have it there for another couple of years and we are going to get that extended until we resolve this issue that area there is SCC Western Power, what-ever it is, switchboard, switchyard which cause us a few troubles there too, we would have to work in with them. That big green shed you are talking about is a chlorination facility for the water.

Colin: Is there anymore questions for Ken at this moment? Yes Fiona.

Fiona: Ken there is a treatment plant there too isn't there?

Ken: People call the chlorination building a treatment plant and yes it is treating water by adding chlorine to it but that is not the treatment plant similar to what we are talking about now or the Wanneroo or the Mirrabooka or any of the other treatment plants, it is just simply a chlorination facility and I think it has a fluoridation. Fluoridation correction and chlorine but that's all associated with if you forget the fluoridation one its all associated with adjusting the PH so the chlorine actually works on the water. There is no sedimentation; there is no drying, and not removing any organic materials or anything like that.

Fiona: So the water that we are getting isn't treated?

Ken: The water you are getting at the moment is treated with chlorine but at the present moment is not treated by filtering or anything like that but it is being treated with chlorine.

Fiona: But we were taken to the Mundaring and I was under the impression that it was a small treatment plant.

Ken: It's a disinfection plant to use the words there that would be a very small part of a full water treatment plant.

Fiona: Say if the water treatment plant was on Sawyer's valley what would happen to all the properties between the weir and Sawyer's valley hills would there have to be a pipe taken back to give them the water?

Ken: Sawyer's valley hills, as far as getting water to people that have water today there would be no change. We would have to get water from the dam to the treatment plant and back to the existing major pipelines that are there but there would be no extra pipes that would be put into service at Mr. or Mrs. Smith's house or anything like that.

Fiona: They wouldn't have to put pipes back to where those pipes came.

Ken: If we are talking big pipes we have to put pipes we have to put major pipes from the dam to the treatment plant and from the treatment plant to the pipes from the tanks which are on top of the hill there. I can draw it all out for you there and if that's not clear I can come up to your table.

Colin: Karen just here, then we will go over here.

Karen: Further to Fiona's question my understanding was that there is an off-pipe of McCallum road that provides water to all the residents in that area is that what you mean, that there is an off take somewhere by McCallum road. What happens in that instance when the water isn't going to be treated till after McCallum road?

Robert: I think currently some properties are supplied directly off the Mundaring Kalogeria pipeline which is directly off the weir and the Sawyer's valley tank but if you put a treatment plant at the Sawyer's valley site we would probably need to put a pipeline, they are relic pipelines that would have to supply those areas that are currently served off.

Karen: Because there would be the weir the hotel facilities there at the weir, so would they be included in that?

Robert: Yes currently there is an off-tank that comes off the main pipeline into a small tank that feeds the properties near the weir so I think those would have to be taken off the supply of the pipeline and have a separate pipeline off the main tank. They would be small pipes and not big ones.

Ken: I can answer that a little bit more and I'm sorry I didn't think you were talking about the Mundaring village type area, if we supply a house with a small reticulation line of the main line there actually referred to a non-rated service and we can't guarantee quantity, quality and we can't guarantee that there is water at any time that is why it is called a non-rated service. I think what you are talking about is Mundaring village area they are served with chlorinated water from the

pipeline from the bunderleah tank. A very small tank at the bunderleah site there it gravitates down to the weir hotel and all the other houses there. The question that I asked to people about that some months ago now was there is no plan to service them with anything other than chlorinated water because of the large detention time a small chlorination injection plant at that area there with very little quantities of chlorine at all can be installed just to service those small areas. They're no plan to do that with this project and I ask the question some months ago.

Karen: So those houses wouldn't then have the benefit of the filtration process.

Ken: Not unless another main was taken from the treatment plant.

Colin: Thank-you Karen and just over here. We can probably take one more after his. Ken will be available as well, now over to Lois.

Lois: I have a different question. Last week the Noongar people were granted extensive land rights throughout the state which would be taking all of this I would imagine is there anyone from the aboriginal land council tonight? That is just another tack that will have to be overcome in the future.

Ken: In the short term we have had available, I have made a couple of enquires and all I can really say is whatever site we are looking at, and if you look at the spreadsheet you have out, everyone of them have issues of aboriginal or heritage native title that do have to be dealt with. Most of the sites that we have had native titles distinguished, the national park runs haven't but the one on the top of hill possible has because it was vested there for water supply purposes and things like that. To answer your question yes in such short notice it is another thing we have to consider as we go down the track.

(Unheard talking)

One of the big issues on it of course is before we actually resolve what it means there could be several more high court cases. So to me its just another issue, and yes it is a big issue, but another issue that has been identified in the spreadsheet as an issue even well before the latest handing down from the federal court.

(Unknown): I make no apologies for my acid tongue because I love coming to these meetings. We are on Wajuk country the elder were not told exactly was going on Mundaring hill. They were told that tanks were going there, that is what they approved. They didn't approve one hundred and eighty tonnes of rock being removed from that site. Obviously you are quite hopeful, The Water Corporation and the government hopeful that there will be an appeal, the fact is this is Wajuk country it belongs to Noongars and they have not been consulted adequately by The Water Corporation on any of the sites, in fact the have been discluded from my perspective. The next thing I would like to say is that I'm very interested in finding out support that The Department of Water come to all further meetings and that we be given a list of the decision makers in The Department of Water to check if they have any conflicts of interest, what associations they may have to the heritage council or other such decisions. I am fascinated tonight why you have not included Keith Lench's architectural drawings of the site below the dam. A beautiful drawing rendered, iron very masculine, suited the weir perfectly as far as I'm concerned. Sinking into the undulating wasteland below the weir, I don't

understand why that plant hasn't been shown to us tonight, if you would like a copy of Keith Lench's work naturally I have them my home.

The other thing is I don't find this process inclusive or open, I find that the process has been fowled from the beginning and has been concluded to be fowled. I listen each meeting that I come to the heritage council now they are concerned about some wood cuts. No time during this time have I heard the heritage council talk about the indigenous significance of the Mundaring hill or I'm sure professor Bolton may speak of Fiona Gordon's property which deals with the founding fathers from a colonial perspective and significant of site four and site five. I want to know when Noongar rights are going to be included. Why we aren't just looking at a compromise site which would be obviously the DEC site. It's much degraded, can't see white can't have a plant there. Not at all, that is the compromise. Is the heritage council ever going to compromise then yet again just a few people going push a plant onto thousands of people to save a couple.

Ken: I can't add much more to that comment, the specific questions I will talk a few seconds about the aboriginal consultation we had Robert, Reg and Sharon here last week. As far as noongar people there are seventeen different people who have expressed interest in this area, there are seventeen different groups which we are obliged to see. The registry title claims I believe there are three specifically, they have all been invited along to these forums but have declined to come on here because under our act and their act we have to deal with them independently and directly and the advise that I have from our aboriginal people is that process that we are undertaking is appropriate. You like a lot of other people have them and if people want to see them they can have a look at them too. No problem.

Colin: Any other questions I can problem squeeze one more in. Ok, what I suggest that we push on with Professor Bolton's presentation and then we will take a break. Can I just invite Jeffery to come and talk with you on issues of heritage and history, and thank him very much for his time.

Pro. Jeffery Bolton: Now I'm very grateful to you for giving time to a blow in like myself, and I want to concentrate particularly on the heritage issue because, A that is my subject but B it strikes me as quite remarkable that site one should be ruled out by the minister without any indication of who the minister has consulted, what is the qualified standing of the people that gave that advise and I will come to that in a few minutes. First of all I want to say that heritage involves a number of different perspectives and a number of different stakeholders. First of all there is the heritage of the bush itself, no longer as pristine as it was in 1829 but still very much worth preserving. Miles spoke earlier about the population growth of Perth by 2030, and that is not so long down the track, there will be two million people in Perth metropolitan area and no sign of it stopping growing. We need to make sure that enough remains of our original bush so that our children and grandchildren are not going to feel deprived of something that we once had. So that is the first point.

Next in priority and a recent speaker that expressed very movingly the concerns of this group, there are the original Noongar the Wajuk people who had the custodianship of this district for at least forty or fifty thousand years, perhaps longer. But I think we can over do the difficulty of consulting with the numerous families and the numerous small groups who claim kinship with the original

aboriginal settlers, because the remarkable thing about the recent judgment on the determination of the federal court about the Noongar claim to land rights was that it was a unified approach, it took six years and during that time numerous different families, numerous different individuals were persuaded to fuse their claim into one common application. And it is not an application that isn't going to make much difference to most of us. Its bearing on the decision that we have been tackling tonight, which is simply if there is a choice finding a location which is acceptable to contemporary Noongar thought and which lies within the feasibility of erecting the treatment plant and making a good job of it then of course that has to be preferred. Its so simple probable doesn't need to be said but it needs to be said time and again.

The third point is that after the aboriginal chapter was the settlers' society and we must not despise cultivated environment as part of our heritage. Cultivated environment as a result of the work of the post 1829 Western Australians put into creating this society is something to be cherished. Now in the case of this district in 1883 which was tragically the year of the second of the great measles epidemic, which killed so many of the first inhabitants of this region, in 1883 the eastern railway was opened up, the old railway line that runs through Darlington to Mundaring and that attracted the earliest agricultural settler and that was Peter Goodrey a Swiss a good friend of both Alexandra and John Forrest probably alerted to the potential of country by the Alexandra Forrest I believe and one hundred and twenty-five years ago took up the land and what must be one of the oldest continuously run orchid properties anywhere in the state. It's a region where we know that John Forrest came for picnics, there are the photographs there are the stories.

End of Tape One, Side Two

...Point to remember is this is land that has been worked and looked after and created into a landscape for more than a century. Now in 1896 when the plans were made to make the Mundaring pipe line this site in the Helena valley was selected by far the best from an engineering point of view and it was selected because, and I've seen the documents where C.Y O'Connor off-side wrote that it was very suitable, although there had been some alienation of land, that it was not so great that it would be incompatible with the purposes of a preeminent large reservoir. And if the incompatibility didn't exist in 1896 I can't quite see why it would exist in 2006. So that this notion that some cultivated farms could exist side by side with a large catchment area established and accepted. I come now to the point of your heritage. There are number of principals in heritage and the ones that concern us are this. First of all that where there is a development of a technological or an industrial sort such as the water treatment plant which is proposed, it is better not to have these plant scattered over a wide area. It is better where an industrial precinct already exists perhaps to coax that development close to that industrial precinct. Mundaring weir is an industrial precinct of a kind; it is a work of modern technology of its time. But, as some may argue, that is the technology of the early 20th century, that is the technology of a hundred years ago, that is worth cherishing because it is old and different, but we don't want any new nasty new technology coming in to the same site. We can not imagine that the tourist of 2100, the early 1920th century weir and the early 21st century water treatment plant would seem all part of the same historical story would be enhanced by a water treatment plant from the early 21st century because it would show the advance of technology. We do not go to the tower of

London to simply see what William the Conqueror built in 1066. We do not refuse to see the bits that the Tudors put up and say 'well that is not the original 1066 tower of London we don't want that,' but we do say that we want the developments to be sympathetic compatible with one another. And my hunch is that this site could take a water treatment plant at a location not too far from the existing scene that we have now. I do not know who advised the minister that site one should be rejected because of the tourism and heritage values. I do not think referred to the history council; it may have been referred to the heritage council so if so why can this not be stated in public, why are the reasons not being given. I think there is a mistaken view of heritage, that heritage is something that was stopped a hundred years ago and that nothing else can be added to it and nothing else can be done with it has to sit there, frozen in time, a museum piece. Well I think what we have the chance of creating here if it is done right is a bit more than a museum piece, it would be a place where future generations come and see the advances which have taken place in water technology and different responses which have been devised by successive generations of skilled practitioners in meeting the needs of a growing city. That is how it could be presented.

Now I have one last point, it has been said that some bush will have to be disturbed and in Ken's very illusive presentation there was a fair view of how some sites would disturb a lot greater than others. Well we have also heard tonight Miles' very useful comment of an offset of some kind. I think there are sets to be had and I will tell you of one possibility that may not be in the realm of practical politics but it is this. Paul Hasluck, that eminent government general, historian and many other things owned a piece of land over in Paul's Valley which was his retreat from public cares, he would go there on weekends and listen to music, both classical and jazz, it was along way away from any other pair of ears and enjoyed the recreation of the bush. In his will he provided that a trust should be set up comprising partly members of his family, part of the University of Western Australia and that piece of bush should be left totally unchanged for the next one hundred years. It would not be a conference center or a scout camp or anything like that but Paul wisely foresaw that the Perth metropolitan area would keep on growing and late in the 21st century people would value the fact that it was a substantial piece of land that let it show them exactly what the Darling Range had been like generations previously. And that land is still there, but I wonder as an outcome of the discussion we are having investigation might not be made as to whether some way could be devised for securing this land for the public for all time. I believe that Paul's family would be very responsive to such an outcome and that there would be a plus, as well as any temporary minus' that would happen as a result of the plan. What I am saying is that I think that the minister was miss-taken in the quality of the advice, given of site one, and as I hear from Ken it is still a site from every other point of view that he finds acceptable to work with. There is one or two of the alternatives, possibly the CALM land that might meet the criteria advised. But why should we go there, why can't we focus on the question of heritage and say that it is only because that concept that has been miss-understood that we are having all this tribulation now, but let us take it back to the minister and say consult again, thank-you very much.

Colin: Jeffery is happy to take any questions if there are any questions on the floor? Lois yes.

- Lois: It is not a question but a huge thank-you, what an honor it is to hear you speak tonight, thank-you very much for coming. And I hope that people in the room can hear you and understand that site one has a heritage site, as a working site is absolutely incredible. Well done, thank-you very much.
- (Unknown): The only thing is big brown tanks and drying beds that take up sixty acres are not very attractive and I care about heritage, my grandfather Harry Fredrick Johnston set aside John Forrest national park for the people of Perth when C Y O'Connor was chief engineer and John Forrest was premier so I do care about the hills, so I would prefer something like the CALM or DEC site if it could be put away from areas that destroy the public amenity.
- Professor: My understanding and Ken can correct me if I'm wrong but the necessity of disturbing the landscape as little as possible and concealing the least picturesque bits of the operation have been in your mind from the start, but if I'm wrong correct me Ken.
- Ken: First of all thank-you very much it was a great presentation. Certainly taking your point on board the whole thing is part of the argument. Jeffery has eloquently spoken about the heritage issue as part of the documentation which has presented to the minister which before was heritage yes but was more, or just as much on the heritage tourism potential of the area. Now as Miles was saying make it part of history then I think it fits quite well, however that is in conflict with the tourism planning which has been done, the documents about so thick and the plan was up here a couple of meetings ago where he has a business in the middle of that and no doubt wants more tourism. Any tourism around a facility like a dam world wide is accepted as a great modern facility and we should take on board it is a disturb area it is part of history already, there is no real reason why it shouldn't be there, but we need to take on board opinions of all people.
- Professor: He runs a good pub and I enjoy going there, but you will not thinking of locating anything were I would be sitting out in the beer garden and have this thing right in my sites.
- Ken: Actually this is a great way of doing it, the answer is definitely no, however I don't normally go to the pub, however I have been to the picnic area below the weir with my famous red wine and enjoyed some great days with my family, and if it is consistent with that I'm also happy too.
- Professor: Well it could be consistent, yes.
- (Unknown): I would just like to draw a distinction in looking at something and looking at something OK. If you look down on a treatment plant as part of a landscape it doesn't look to good I don't think, so I would have reservations about looking down on a drying bed going into Helena valley. Helena Valley is a landscape to be looked at and enjoyed untouched. So I wouldn't support it one if it meant putting the drying beds in Helena Valley.
- The other kind of looking is that it is an industrial plant so lets go and have a look in there and see if it works, that's the other kind of look at what I was talking about, I would just like to make that distinction.
- (Unknown): Just following on from those comments has anyone looked at ways to actually make the whole plant more attractive given that it is the cheaper option in site

one. Are there ways in which you could use landscaping techniques to make this more attractive and maybe building a designed building and so on?

Ken: Very simply yes and we do that. Each of our projects now usually have a panel of architects and landscape architects involved and in a project this size we would certainly have a considerable expenditure on that and you are certainly taking into account visibility from every site from every area. Some people as we are probably aware down here just don't want a treatment plant where you can see it; other people have the other side of it.

(Unknown): Thank-you very much Professor Bolton it is something that we have been waiting to hear for a long time we have been much concerned about the best elite group that were part of the original decision for having it moved away from site one and it is amazing how some of these people are finally coming out of the woodwork and owning up to being part of that. I find it very difficult to rationalize that one person who conducts a hotel as tourist attraction should be given such weight against the community who are going to have this dreadful thing so close to our children and clearing so much of our bush.

Colin: Just down here and that will be the last of our questions.

(Unknown): I think that I should make some things clear because you obviously know that I'm the national trust and these were one of the people who actually made an objection because you should know because the original plan, and they did go to the heritage council and they did go to The Water Corporation, there was extensive consultation Mundaring shire etc, the idea was that yes there were on display on the Mundaring shire, the idea was to encourage tourism. For instance, one of the things they said was to build a business centre on the opposite side where the museum is and have a visitor's center and tell people the story. Another of the ideas was to encourage disabled access and have a boardwalk around the river another idea was to use the timber houses in the CALM area as well and create a little village like Ballarat or something like that. Recreate that and have old shops and encourage tourism in Mundaring. So it was something that was taken we the good of the community in mind. Having said that I have to tell you that Megan has actually been to see Anne and Anne my boss is probably present that plan to you which was approved by a lot of people. But on the other hand we have already spoken to Robert and spoken to others and if worst comes to worst we are going to make most of it. The sort of thing that Miles told you, instead of the visitors centre perhaps The Water Corporation, because we already do tours at the number one pump station and tell people about the history, maybe we could come to a compromise. I'm an educationalist; I want to tell people a story of the cost of keeping things flowing, how we have had to change over time. So I just thought you should hear both sides of the argument, thank-you.

(Unknown): The public consultation on the 1999 site that was approved by the EPA and the government before The National Trust got involved was very similar to the process The Water Corporation used when they advertised the plant in 2002 which resulted in EPA appeals and this process that we are going on now. The consultation to the community was a selected group of the community and was not given to the broader community, it was not advertising of any kind that would have bought in the larger community. The point that I would like to make is that the architectural impressions that Keith Lench, the previous project manager of

the Mundaring Weir water treatment plant and the person that you put responsible for what you class as a disinfection plant at Mundaring weir that he referred to us on the tour as a treatment plant is a incredible drawing. Lots of teal, lots of okra colours as I said fitting into the undulating landscape there was never any of intention for the residual beds to be at that site. There is views showing you what it would look like from the weir, pictorially very masculine but quite a piece of art the residual beds were never going to go at Mundaring weir, they were going to choose a site at Helena Valley, which was inappropriate, it can go un-cleared lands so the DEC would be perfect for residual beds. Obviously there is an opportunity for The National Trust to perhaps work for a compromise on this site and not push it onto people at all. You have the DEC site.

Colin: Thank-you all for your patience, it has been a long series of presentations but we did want to try and provide the opportunity there hear these issues. Can you thank Professor Bolton for giving up his time?

Can I suggest we take a five or ten minute break? Robert has asked me to just let you know that the computers up the back do have the fly-overs on them if you want to have a look either during the break or afterwards. Could we come back in about five minutes into the syndicate groups and I will explain what we are going to do, thank-you.

(Break)

Colin: Could we resume our seats please so we can start again? We have had a couple of people who had to go, they have just apologized. I guess that part of the purpose of this evening was to provide you with a bit more information to enable us in the October forum to start narrowing down viable options to explore in more detail. We aren't actually going to do that now and one of the reasons for that is a matter of time. We wanted to get through the presentations but I guess two things we would like to do in these syndicate groups.

The first task is you will find in your workbook a table which contains a list of the criteria that have been developed by this forum. That is a list of the ones that over the last two meetings the forum had identified what it believed were essential criteria. Robert can you just move that for us again. If we have a look down that coming out of the last two forums were these essential criteria. These were the criteria you have been working on last two forums and this was a proposed ranking when you came out of the syndicate group discussion. You will see that there were small as possible environmental impact, safety for residents, limit amenity impact for residences, least disruptive and best practice infrastructure, no compulsory acquisition for private property, the one that a number groups discussed and recommended last week was no site to be considered if private land owners are unwilling to sell, all sites assessed for heritage, social and cultural impact and the last one was not so much a criteria but people were saying that they wanted to insure all adequate site information was provided.

There were two criteria that people then suggested were important and they were the issue of the status of the sites, is it an RPZ? Is it a national park? And cost. So that was the outcomes of the last two forums, what you have in that table and what I am asking is that if we can get some endorsement from this forum about those criteria in terms of your views about which ones are essential, which ones are important or not important, what we are trying to get is an aggregate of the

criteria from those forums and their importance. Then we will be in a position in the October forum to start using these and maybe some other criteria to start to make some narrowing down of the sites.

Robert can I have that wheel? This is a rather complex diagram but you have it on you table and I also have some hard copies. At one of the earlier forums The Water Corporation outlined what it believed were some of the possible criteria that might be used. What I have then done with Robert's assistance is to group in the red squares to enable us to compare the criteria that were discussed by the syndicate groups in the last two forums to The Water Corporations criteria. So what you have got in the outer circle the criteria proposed by The Water Corporation then within that you have got a grouping of the criteria that were identified by this forum over the last two forums. So you can see there are some similarities, there are some differences, but there is some similarity. So what I am asking people to do tonight in the syndicate groups is to indicate in those red criteria you have identified which of those are essential, which of those are important, which of those are not important to you. What I will then do is try and get an aggregate to get some picture about those so we can then begin to apply in the October forum to narrow those sites down. We need a structured process to do this. One reason for that is that we have a large number of people, but the other reason is that we need to do this so the process can stand; it has some rigor so in some sense so stakeholders who aren't here can't easily criticize the process because it hasn't been relatively rigorous. So what I am asking you to do is using the workbook rank those red criteria which are the forum's criteria in terms of essential important and not important. Now what is important is that I get the workbooks back from you tonight or that you get it back to me as quick as you can following tonight. If you have time in the syndicate groups what I suggest is you may have a discussion in you groups about tonight's presentations and whether there is anymore information or requirements you have that The Water Corporation could present you before in October where we start narrowing sites down. So there may be some information, there may be a document, there may be someone else to speak I'm interested in you having that brief discussion in your syndicate groups. But the first task is to really rank those criteria so we can get some endorsement of their importance.

We have got through to about; we won't necessarily hear a report back, so I guess we work through until about 9:25pm. Then I will talk a little bit about what happens from here. All I want to you to rank them is essential, not essential, important, we don't need numbers just that criteria. I should just point out we are not locking ourselves in there may be others. We are just having a go at it at this stage. U may want to have a discussion in your group or you may just want to do it.

(Syndicate Group Discussions)