

The Water Corporation Mundaring Deliberative Forum

Forum 6- October 2006

[Opening of meeting]

Colin Penter: Those of you who don't know me my name is Colin Penter, I have been the facilitator for this process. I do not work in The Water Corporation although I am employed by them to facilitate this process. Thank-you for your attendance in this the sixth forum, I appreciate again people giving up your time on a Monday evening to come and consider these issues. Ill just make a couple of comments on what we hope to get through tonight and then we will make a start.

Hopefully the plan this evening is that we will use the criteria developed in this forum over the last couple of forums to identify between one and three sites for more detailed analyses. So hopefully we are not asking you to agree on one site tonight, although that may be the outcome of it, but we are hoping to identify between one and three sites that can be subject to more detailed analyses as there are still some more information I know people would like on specific sites. So hopefully by the end of the evening we will have gone through a process that will lead us towards having one, two or three sites identified for more detailed analysis. What we hope to do is both an individual and group rating of the sites, using the criteria that has been developed by this forum. Your individual ratings and your group ratings that the facilitators will try and work to achieve will be analysed and the results feed back to the forum for further consideration and endorsement. So we are not trying to get to one site, and we are not necessarily trying to get to a number of sites we are trying to get to a smaller number, it may be one, maybe two or maybe three, or four or five but hopefully three. It is also important to say that the information that comes out of the forum tonight will also be sent out to the wider register of participants explaining to them what have been possible site options identified by this forum, what were the criteria we used and what the process was as well. The idea is that those options will then be reviewed by The Water Corporation and that information provided by this forum for a final decision about a preferred site or sites. That is likely to occur in 207. So we aren't trying to get to one site tonight, but we are hoping to identify a smaller number for more detailed analysis.

Some of you would have noticed on the workbooks that there were a couple of significant requests for speakers and we have acted on those for this evening. We have three speakers that will present and then we will have an opportunity for questions. The two speakers were suggested by the feedback in the workbooks. One of those is Anne Brake who is here somewhere. Anne is from the National Trust, is the manager of the golden pipeline and will talk about some of the national trust perspectives on issues. The other person that was requested was Fiona Jordon, that some of you may know is land holder at site four. But Fiona is going to talk primarily with assistance from Bill Macarthur who is a soil scientist and plant ecologist who has worked with the CSIRO for fifty years who has been assisting with some of the issues to do with the Sawyers Valley hill site. So Fiona and Bill will speak as well.

The third speaker will be Ken Walter, the reason for that is I have asked The Water Corporation to provide the forum with a brief presentation of The

Corporations views on possible sites using the criteria developed from this forum. So Ken will talk briefly about that and a couple of other issues that have been raised in the workbook.

So the idea would be if we have a look up here, the first presentation will be Fiona and Bill and at the end of their presentation we will then take questions then will be followed by Anne Brake from The National Trust, then Ann will take questions. Then Ken Walter from The Water Corp will talk briefly and take any other questions either about his presentation or about issues that you may wish to ask the corporation. At that stage we will take a break and after that break work in syndicate groups to try to do an individual and group rating of those sites. It is also important to point out that there is more information still being gathered that will be presented to the forum on some of the sites requiring more detailed analysis. GHD particularly Megan has been working on the flora and fauna survey on a number of sites and that information will be presented as part of the more detailed assessment as will some of the heritage issues particularly around some of aboriginal issues and issues to do with safety and risk hazard assessment as part of that more detailed assessment.

So what ill do is ask Fiona and Bill to speak to the forum. They will be speaking primarily about some of their research into the Sawyers Valley hill site and I think other issues to do with the apology. So I will hand over to Fiona and Bill.

Fiona Gordon: Good evening I am Fiona Jordon I am a part owner of site four. I will be talking about site four and site five and how they relate to each other and to the heritage of Mundaring. I will show you the historical titles belonging to the land and some maps. This is a copy of a survey undertaken by Peter Goodjery who was the first to take up land for agriculture in the area. This survey was dated 1882. It is up on the right hand corner and they are a survey of site four. This is a title he was granted in 1883, so he acquired the land in 1883, these are copies of the original titles, note that John Forrest was commissioner of land at the time. Its two titles and he paid twenty pounds sterling for each of them. In 1890 he bought this block and he probably bought the other ones two, but I haven't put too many titles on because it could get a bit boring because there is actually seven titles on the land. So he acquired this in 1890 lot 1203 which is part of site four, and I don't know if you can read that but it says Victoria by the grace of god of United Kingdom of Great Britain and island queen defender of the faith emperors of India etc etc etc. To all whom these present shall come. Greeting know ye of our special grace certain knowledge and mere notion have given and granted and we do by these presents for us airs and successors in consideration of the sum of thirteen pounds, nine shillings and sixpence sterling. It was a bit smaller block so I suppose that is why it was cheaper. As in 1893 Mathieson Jacoby whose stone is outside this hall acquired the land and renamed it Mundaring vineyard. You probably can't see it is where it is sold to Jacoby. Then in 1893 this title he has actually acquired the land, I don't know, maybe Jeff Bolden can tell us, why the Mundaring vineyard company is written on the title. This is where it relates to site five and I didn't mention that Anthony Goodjery developed a vineyard on the property in 1883 and he called it St Bernard's. Jacoby took note of the aboriginals who lived on the hill above the farm and found that they called the hill, site five, Mundaring. Which they actually they pronounce a bit differently, but it means high place on high place. You can see that it is the highest place where the tanks are so that is how Mundaring go its name. To me it seems terrible if the water

treatment plant will be where Mundaring got its name from. So he renamed it Mundaring vineyard and these vineyards Goodjery and Jacoby were both wine merchants and St Bernard's would have been one of the first vineyards in Western Australia. It's in wine books and history books. This is a historical cottage believed to date back to 1890. We are not really sure but it is a very old cottage. It is still occupied and you can see how close it is to site five, it is only 600m. That is the hill where site five is. John Forrest had a hunting lodge on our property Jan Bardinus, I think it was her great grandfather, was the manager on the property and she gave me this information and John Forrest planted this apple tree which is probably 120 years old. That photo was taken last year in February you can see it still has beautiful apples on it. Even the black cockatoo, that please The Water Corp, enjoy the apples as you can see; there are some on the ground.

This is an early map you can see actually writing that says Goodjery platform and Goodjery orchard, so that map was made before 1893. Later on in 1894 Jacoby's name was changed to Mundaring platform. Then it was moved back into the town as the town developed and that was then called Mundaring after the vineyard. This is a photo of the Mundaring wine company that was taken by the western mouth. It's not a very good photo but its got a picture of the hillside of Mundaring and a picture of this cellar in Perth. But they did have a cellar on the farm as well. In 1898 a few years later there was the construction of the Mundaring weir and this is the Mundaring railway station in 1899 and Mundaring was declared a town on the 20th of May 1898. This would be the railway station that is in the sculpture park now. This photo was taken in September 2006 of site four farm. Some of the trees, not these trees, the pears are about seventy years old. Now bill is going to talk about site five.

Bill Macarthur: I am going to talk about site five; more specifically I want to give what I think are good or compelling reasons why site five should not be selected as the site for the treatment plant. I walked through the forest up around the tanks several times and I have been impressed by the forest there. Last time I walked through there I also picked up a kangaroo tick and if you have ticks you also have kangaroos. Actually I didn't want to bring the kangaroos into this but I think I need all the help I can get. What I see in the forest are really all the elements of a good Jarrah forest. There are lots of species, I can't tell you if there are any rare or endangered because that would take a lot of detailed work and I haven't done that. But what I have seen are lots of species that are common to Jarrah forests, but also I see the structure there as well. A jarrah forest typically has four layers, the tall trees, the small trees, the shrubs and the ground cover. So all of those are present, which is a good sign for a good quality and un-touch Jarrah forest. But of course this isn't completely un-touch, it has been cut over, but it's pretty good for its history.

There are several points that I want to make about why I think it is worth preserving. First one is that is an example of Kessel's working plan, as you probably know jarrah is very difficult to generate from seedlings, so he devised a scheme by letting stumps regenerate and sending up re-growth and reducing the number of stems that were left. So this area is an example of his scheme of regeneration when all around there was ring barking to kill the native vegetation for a water catchment or pine plantations. This hatched represents ring barking and right down beside the dam there is some pine plantations that are more

heavily hatched. That green area number two, with the circle, that is an example of Kessels regeneration plan and that I believe has heritage value.

The most impressive thing to me is that this forest contains members of the old original forest giants. The big old jarrah and marri lots of the greater than a meter and half in diameter. Some of them are dead of course, but as you can see some of them are living there. I haven't seen the one called the queen jarrah but I assume that it is equivalent in age to that generation. So that is the most impressive thing to me about this forest and in the bottom left corner there is banksias that is regenerating, which is a good thing because it is always a very good feature of jarrah forests because it means there are no die back there. Banksias are very sensitive to die back. This shows the regeneration with the trees coming away from the stump and so that sort of regeneration is still quite evident in a lot of places. That isn't a very good photo but there are lots of examples like that. Can we just go back for a second? In one stump we found a steel spike driven in, we call it Kessels spike, I'm not sure what it is, if we could ever find out what it was meant for we could make it a heritage spike. Ok thank-you. This shows some really nice quality forest, this shows some regeneration from a stub that shows a ring barking mark around the original stump. Also on the top one there is an example of another member of the banksias family therefore prone to die back. This shows another one of the old original jarrah and also some really good straight jarrah bowls. Again we have banksias generation looking very healthy. Again banksias, now another presents that has impressed me is the presents of very large casuarinas or sheoaks. These would have been some the biggest casuarinas trees I have seen I'm not sure why they are there. Perhaps they are a result of the original clearing, they grow so vigorously, anyway for whatever reason they are there and very healthy and happy. That is another example, some of these sheoaks are more than half a meter in diameter, which is large for a sheoaks, you see the tags behind there actually. In some cases there are always pure stands of casuarinas.

I just want to close by giving you an example of what can happen. Down the coastal plain I have watched over the years the banksias woodland disappearing. Each time a development took place the developer would say 'well it's only a couple of hectares' and so on. There wasn't any left and now it is very difficult to find any banksias woodland within the metropolitan area. So my message is the time for conservation is now, why would you put a treatment plant in a nice piece of forest when it would appear to be pretty good alternative sites. Thank-you.

Colin Penter: If anyone would like to ask either Bill or Fiona any questions, we can probably take a couple of questions now.

(Unknown): Was that tree with the yellow skirt; was that the 500 year old jarrah tree that is so famous in the Sawyers Valley area? It's another one is it?

Unheard talking

(Unknown): Surely The Water Corporation wouldn't have there eyes on that area would they? Not with a 500 year old jarrah tree surely.

(Unknown 2): Were all those pictures you have shown us tonight, were they in site five or outside of site five?

Unheard talking

(Unknown 2): Haven't you got dieback already?

(Unknown 3): I went to the site on the bus tour and I'm pretty sure I saw die back out there.

Bill: I saw die back in the area, down the slope from the tank on the northern side. There was a big patch of very clearly dieback, but I didn't see any, I think, of where site five was. That is my feeling.

Colin: They were both saying that those were in site five. Are there any other questions at this stage? Ok thank-you very much. As we try to do, there was that suggestion that Fiona presents and as a land owner on site four we thank her and Bill for their presentation. Our second speaker, Anne Brake is the manager of the golden pipeline. Anne is with The National Trust and she is going to speak on The National Trust perspective of some of these sites. Thanks Anne.

Anne Brake: Thank-you everybody for the opportunity to address the group tonight. As has already been said my name is Anne Brake and I am the manager of the golden pipeline for The National Trust. While I haven't been here all the way through Diana Frylinck from the trust has been a regular member of this group. The National Trust has been very interested in this process as you will see from my presentation.

So I want to start with a few basic principals in which the trust operates and what our role in the Mundaring precinct is and I want to comment on two sites, not sites four and five but on the Mundaring weir precinct and on the CALM site. The Trust is a community based organization that aims to conserve and interpret Western Australia's heritage, which includes social, aesthetic, scientific and historic values. This is achieved within a legislative framework as well as through community involvement. Central to The Trust's act and our day to day activities is through our education, both in terms of heritage values of our properties, but also about wider and holistic heritage values including built, indigenous and natural heritage. We are then very mindful of environmental impact as part of the decision making process for developments. The Trust recognizes that for Mundaring weir is an operational site and believes that its continued use as a water management facility within a heritage framework is a very good way for it to retain its cultural heritage values. The Trust respects indigenous heritage and it will not disrespect or argue against claims of indigenous values. The Trust sees itself as a stake holder in the Mundaring weir precinct but only one in a number and makes the following comments from its perspective.

The Trust has been involved with the Mundaring precinct since the late 1990's with the formation of the golden pipeline project. As the slide shows you this project aims to interpret the history of the goldfields water supply scheme and bring tourism, social and economic benefit to the places it passes through. To do that The Trust works closely with the eleven government authorities and communities that makes up the length of the pipeline.

The Trust sees the precinct as a key site, because it is one of the bookends of our golden pipeline heritage trail, it's an easy day trip from Perth, it has a long history of tourism and some of you may know of the picnic trains that used to come into the weir and you can see here they had a band to receive them when they came for their day trips. This is one of our favorite photographs taken below the wall and on the southern side of the precinct that will be talking about in a moment. Obviously the construction of level one pump station and you can see there the railway tressel that was built at the same time as the station and that was used to bring coal initially to the pump station. Now there are still some footings of that treasel beside number one pump station. A very important site for us again on the southern side of the river is the old construction camps, this is the original camp construction of the weir, there were also camps built for the raising of the weir wall which happened in the 1940's and 1950's. Not only were there construction camps within that southern side notice on the top right hand side of the photograph a batching plant for the cement. This was very important and innovative use of technology for this time. I will just leave it there. So as you can see from those few photos the precinct has strong educational potential and that there are a number of sites that contribute to potential to tell not only historic but to provide information on the contemporary developments of the site and on water management. Also that there a number of sites that need expert heritage management to ensure that their value isn't lost and where most concerned about the archeological sites particularly the construct camp and matching plant.

The Mundaring precinct is listed on the national estate, the national estate was run by the Australian heritage commission it is now an outdated register, and this new legislation has been bought in at a national level, but the national estate still remains as indicative listing of sites of national importance. It is currently being reviewed by the state heritage council for listing on the state register.

A draft conservation plan is being drawn for the precinct and I have a copy here for anyone that wants to have a look at it. For them the precinct includes the wall, the area below the dam and that precinct around the hotel, the houses, the mechanic institute etc. So this conservation plan, remembering it is a draft plan identifies a range of values so I have pick out the ones I thought were the most relevant to our discussions tonight. The place comprises of distinct and comparably rare landscape including in innovative structional and hydraulic design of the dam wall and central spillway with timber and iron walkway, together with classical design features of the upper and lower valve house which are juxtaposed with the reservoir of impounded water with its enclosing valley comprising pine plantation in natural vegetation. So what that basically says its engineering is a very important aspect and built into those aesthetic values including the upper and lower valve house.

The locality has significance for aboriginal people. The place has been a popular destination for outings, picnics and passive recreation from the time of its construction to the present. The weir and its environment will form a significant cultural environment. The raising of the weir incorporated a number of features including the first use of a concrete pump pressure grouting in Western Australia. The weir gardens are associated with Patty Dawson who laid them out in the 1920's and John Oldman the landscape architect who was associated with landscape design of the development with the O'Connor museum in the 1960's. The construction and dam raising involved the establishment of a town site associated a community of workers which represents a way of life no longer

practiced on major engineering projects in Australia. The place has archeological potential to provide information on construct techniques associated with the construction and raising of the weir and the material culture of dam workers and their families at the turn of the century and in the 1940's and 1950's.

Over the past six or seven years the national trust has been involved with the precinct. We have prepared a master plan for the site to improve the immensities that are there and to provide the public with a better understanding of the precinct, how it works, its history etc. Based on a consultation process the plan includes making the site more accessible for those with mobility issues and I know a number of you have looked at the bigger plan that's over there, it's the same thing. There is the idea of an aerial walkway that will allow people with mobility issues, whether it's walking or with wheel chairs, prams those kinds of things, to get down below the dam area, which is fairly important. Those steps do deter a lot of people. As well as providing a playground for children based around water management and pumping principals and a visitor information centre that will provide not only administered and visitor services facilities for the precinct but will build on the story of water management that will begin at number one pump station for the work that we have done there.

So other things that we have done is we have developed number one pump station including conservation work to the buildings, interpretation work and a temporary learning center. We have developed two walk trails through the precinct in the catchment area. We have interpreted signage throughout the place to inform people about various aspects of the precinct and how they go together and we get a good number of people using them. We are also in the process of developing a multi-use trail that connect Mundaring weir to Northam and we are hoping to launch that at the beginning of next year, some of you may already use the kept track.

So what are the future ideas and options that are available to us? If Mundaring weir is to remain an operational site then we need to recognize that there will be future developments. That we need to work with The Water Corporation and other stakeholders to minimize the loss of heritage values, we need to work with them to access information about the place and we need to maintain the place as a day trip destination. The National Trust has been working with Water Corp over the last several years in this regard and has been given the opportunity to comment on a number ideas and minor works initiatives in the area. The Trust is keen to enhance interpretation opportunities within the precinct which will give people a better understanding of the place and provide more activities for people to do and to change their visiting patterns reclaiming the weir as a day trip destination rather than just a stop on a days outing, and this is something that we think is really important, is to provide enough activities in the area to attract people and to help to stay. That's educational facilities, recreational facilities and picnicking and those kinds of things. So developments at the weir can therefore provide opportunities for The Trust but that said we do not favor the development of the water treatment plant at the weir for several reasons. You can see in this more detailed version of the larger plan; the hatched area is the area where the water treatment plant, I was told, would cover. It is the whole of that southern side below the weir precinct area, so all of that area would be lost.

... This is a very popular picnic area for many of you you've probably stood there in the 1996 overflow, it has always been a popular place and fingers crossed if we ever have an overflow again people will still be able to stand and watch it from there.

(Unheard Question)

It contains the only current playground and is the site of the proposed water playground as I have already mentioned. It has significant archeological remains of the original construction camps, the camp for the raising of the weir wall in early 1940's and 1950's and the footings for the matching plant. It has remnant bush, it is the area for the proposed aerial walk way which will provide access for that lower area to number one pump station and there will be a precinct for those with mobility problems. There would be some visual access to the site through installations of viewing platforms but no actual physical access.

So the aesthetics of the plant for safety reason and security reasons the plant would be fenced, this would turn a large percentage of the precinct from a recreational area to an industrial site. There would be loss of cultural heritage significance, significant sights would be destroyed, access to them would be lost and future research and educational potential of these sites would also be lost. There would be loss of amenity, picnic facilities would be limited to above the weir wall, there would be limited access to number one pump station and there would no longer be the ability to do the whole loop through the precinct.

None of these issues would affect the CALM site and we would support the CALM site as a much more viable alternative. For various reasons, that will be discussed more fully later and have already been raised at earlier meetings, it is a good alternative for the location of the water treatment plant. If it went at the CALM site this would ensure that the cultural heritage values of Mundaring weir precinct are maintained and possibly even enhanced. We would have the opportunity to provide more critical mass and to provide better educational opportunities, particularly if funds were made available to construct a visitor center which would link the weir precinct including number one pump station to the new water treatment plant. Many of you would know at number two pump station there is not much past that it is already a walk trail that allows for that kind of connection. Tourism opportunities are enhanced and better managed which is important. Facilities could be built to service the ideas we have discussed it would attract a strong family based audience as well as appeal to visitors whether they are inter-state or international. There is also a strong industrial engineering fraternity that would be interested in visiting the various facilities being discussed. There would be an advantage for other stakeholders in the precinct and in the town ships of Mundaring and Kalamunda. Increased visiting numbers will see people using other facilities in the area and also being made aware of other attractions and activities encouraging them to return to the hills.

So I guess in summary The Trust while it recognizes that the Mundaring weir site is an important management site, we feel that what will be lost through the placement of The Water Treatment plant at that area if the location was the CALM site all of those values could be maintained and in fact there would be greater opportunities for education and recreational activities in the area. We have already spoken with Water Corporation on a number of occasions about

including within in their design processes visual if not physical access to their sites so we can begin a contemporary water management story. So that is basically all I have to say, Thank-you.

Colin Penter: Can I just let everyone know, Anne mentioned this document here which is a conservation plan that a number of people had been requesting. The Water Corporation have put a copy of that document in the Mundaring library here and I also believe they have provided a copy to the Mundaring residences and rates payers group who have been requesting that document for some time and I think Sandra has that copy. So there are two copies one in the library and the other with the residence and rate payers group. Any questions for Anne? Yes just down here, then we will go around the room.

(Unknown): The CALM site which is mentioned is that the CALM site being the airstrip or the CALM site that would be right next to the Kookaburra theatre.

Anne: Ill show you on the big map shall I?

Colin: That would be the depot site I think rather than the airstrip site.

(Unknown): So that is the site near the Kookaburra theatre and the discovery center.

Anne: Yes.

(Unknown 2): Sorry I have been away so I might have missed something. I'm just curious about your process have you basically picked the worst scenario from The National Trust point of view then your preferred option or there are other sites, the one surrounded by national park that I imagine..

Anne: No I don't think there are any other sites that I think we would support.

(Unknown 2): So you have done your worst scenario and you best kind of.

Anne: Yes we are not interested in supporting any other sites that have been presented.

(Unknown 3): I noticed that the fine print on this map is completely illegible for people like me with eyesight problems, could we please have access to what those words are in a document.

Anne: Absolutely I have no problems with that, the only issue that I do have though is the Mundaring weir precinct master plan which was commissioned by the National Trust years ago we have used it tonight more for the map, because it is actually a really good map of the precinct which shows the various facilities that are around. So while I'm saying there are potentials for various amenities that are mentioned on that map and I'm more than happy to give you more information about those problems at all. The information on that is actually not for debate at this particular meeting.

(Unknown 3): I noticed that you also have failed to give dates to a lot of those accuracies and those photos that you have as we have heard this evening from Fiona.

Anne: I'll go back through the photos and give you the dates if you want.

(Unknown 3): Well Fiona's property pre-dates most of those anyway.

Neil: It was interesting to you to make reference to the overflow of the weir as we all know that hasn't occurred for a great many years and I think was pointed out earlier on and the source of the information was The Water Corp that the overflow was actually in fact induced simply by pumping millions of liters of water into the weir because of the high rainfall we had at the time. Going back to your map and you've obviously haven't seen the document, I'll actually show it to you so you will have a better idea of what the water treatment plant will look like down by the weir. This is from the water Corp, it is not covering anywhere near the area that you think it is, and it could be incorporated into providing further education for our kids and for everybody else to come to the site if the water treatment plant is that friendly and is that safe then it could be used as Mile's has suggested as an educational facility.

Anne: Well we are very keen on the educational potential; absolutely that's been a very strong component. I'm interested in looking at that plan that you just showed me because I met with The Water Corporation just last week and that wasn't the information that they gave me at all so I'm only working on the information I got last week to the extend of the plan. At this point I don't know if we know the answer to it, but certainly the educational aspect is something we are very keen to explore, that's central our problems.

John: Anne I'm reading from a document, its called The Australian Heritage Database produced by The Australian Heritage council, after giving a fairly lengthy history of the site at the weir the comment is made in the following words "the owner plans to construct an intensive water treatment plant at the site within the next five years probably on the downstream south bank away from the principal heritage areas of the site. The owner advises that the whole site will be the subject of conservation study and a conservation plan will be prepared prior to this work." The point I am making is the Australian Heritage Council which I assume is the peak body in these matters has expressed no objection to use of the Mundaring weir site as the site of the proposed water treatment plant. Do you have any explanation of this?

Anne: I would have to disagree with you, while they are not actually lodging any objection they actually do say that a conservation plan and study will be done before any decision is made. The other comment that I would make is that The Australian Heritage Commission and The Australian Heritage Council don't have any legal status so they can't actually say yes or no, it doesn't make any difference.

John: So could you explain please what your legal status is? The legal status of the body you represent.

Anne: The National Trust is a statuesque authority in WA. We work under an act of the state. If you hear of something that is classified by the National Trust that has no legal status. Only heritage status in a heritage place in any of the register, be they classifications or whatever, is the state body, the heritage council of Western Australia.

John: So does the State Heritage Council have the capacity to declare this site for example a site that can't be developed for industrial purposes, such as the water treatment plant?

Anne: Yes, at the moment the Mundaring weir is on a back log as I said so the way the heritage council works is they have a series of sites, they have a long list of sites that are coming up for assessment and the Mundaring weir precinct is one of those sites. Now it is not registered so there is no legal way they can stop them in terms of their registration but if a site is being planned for development, so The Water Corporation once all this process has gone through The Water Corp will go to the heritage council to seek approval because it is a government site and it's of a certain age and if anyone within the community wants to raise an objection then the heritage council will look at that site and they can put it through the minister an interim stoppage on it. But at the moment it isn't listed so it doesn't have that protection at that level. Now that said the way the council also works is that if a development application comes up just because a site is registered that doesn't mean that that development can't go ahead, there is a whole series of processes within the heritage council to allow for development, so to arrange for negotiations that go on within that process.

John: To clarify that when you refer to the heritage council..

Anne: I'm talking about the state heritage council yes.

John: One last question, can you identify who the stakeholders are that you have referred to in some of these documents and in your address? Who are they?

Anne: Well there is us obviously.

John: Can you tell me how you get elected? Do you stand for election?

Anne: No, I'm a staff member.

John: Oh ok fine. I'm trying to get clear in my mind whether or not there is a democratic basis for the heritage council.

Anne: Well I work for the National Trust and I manage a project called the Golden Pipeline Project which covers the goldfield water supply scheme. Number one pump station is invested in the National Trust and we own several of the houses opposite of the hotel within the precinct but we don't have any other stakeholders within the precinct. The heritage council, HECWA for short is part of the Department of Housing and Works it's a government department, it reports to the heritage minister, there is a council as it suggests, and I think Geoff Bolton you might be able to put me right on this, I think all of the heritage councilors are actually appointed by the minister. There are a range of different interests, developers, heritage history, and a range of real estate community that are appointed within that heritage council. Then there is the actual public service department that manages the recommendations or liberations of the Heritage council.

John: I think you have answered my question it's not a demographic organization in that sense. I might have a wide representation base. Thank-you.

- Colin: Thanks John. We can take two more then we need to more on.
- (Unknown): I agree with you in some ways that the CALM or the C site might be alright if it doesn't disrupt the amenity of the area with the Kookaburra cinema etc. But in the West Australian newspaper last week and there is apparently going to be a desalination plant in Esperance in 2009, that's two years before the Mundaring water treatment plant costing 440 million.
- Colin: Can I just interrupt you; Ken is going to talk about that particular issue in his presentation. Ken will talk about the desalination plant in his presentation; Anne doesn't have anything to do with that issue.
- (Unknown): Ok, would you think that is ok to have a plant with a lesser footprint would it destroy the amenity of the Kookaburra cinema and bush, is that part of your historical precinct, all those houses.
- Anne: Mundaring precinct doesn't go up as far as the CALM area although we obviously have links with the number two pump station which is just past Jacoby Park and we are very interested in the whole precinct and we just want to find the solution that has the least impact on the place.
- (Unknown): Because that's tourism too.
- Anne: Because there are some very important and significant sights within the Mundaring weir precinct.
- (Unknown): Thank-you
- (Unknown 2): Look I just wanted to put my support for your resistance to put the plant below the weir I also think this would greatly undervalue the recreational capacity of the area. I would even go further in to say that the entire area surrounding the weir is a natural focal point outdoor recreational activities I think that to put the weir anywhere in that vicinity would be a tragedy. I also think the CALM land immediately adjacent to Jacoby Park is an unwise place to put the facility. It would basically destroy the ambience of the park also the bike track that goes immediately by that area.
- Anne: Yes that track is our track and CALM's. From discussions that I have had, and this will be continuing on in tonight's discussions, so I can only say from what I know, like the question about the footprint of the site I can only work from the information that I've got, but I believe that the water treatment plant will be heavily landscaped, which is probably the wrong way to put it, but well landscaped so the impact on say Jacoby park will probably be minimal. Because Jacoby park as you know falls way, because if it was in that area it would be set back from the road and there would be landscaping. So it wouldn't be as obvious as it would be standing on top of the dam looking into it and also that area is much narrower and basically you are just cutting off one whole area of that precinct. So people who come onto the dam from the southern side that is all they get and there is no opportunity to walk around.
- (Unknown 2): You just can't cater people that come to visit the dam, I think there are people that use the walk tracks, and you have premiere long distance walk tracks that go through there. The Kookaburra theatre was mentioned a fantastic facility, so is The Hills discovery centre. I really think that the whole region should be isolated.

Colin: I do want to give him time, I've given everyone else a chance but I would like you to frame it as a question not a statement.

(Unknown 2): Excuse me; I just thought that because it was a related topic I might give my opinion now.

Colin: We were keen for questions for Anne.

(Unknown 2): I'm not familiar with your procedure excuse me.

Colin: Last question just here.

(Unknown 3): Anne I declare for all in this room my interest in this plan because I did work with The National Trust on its preparation. I know that that plan was advertised for public comment and was placed in the Mundaring library and I know it was placed in The National Trust office and I know it was placed in Kalamunda shire's facilities and there was no objection to it. I know it was also published in The Hills Gazette. One of the principal values have mentioned was the archeological value and the future learning centre, I have a question at the end of this, and there was no objections at Kalamunda either because of the tourism issue. I know Mundaring shire is adopted and Kalamunda is an adopted, I know The National Trust is adopted that plan. All of those three requested that it go to the state planning commission to be adopted as a guideline for government agencies for future developments that are envisaged in that plan. There are millions of dollars of facilities envisaged in that plan, can you first of all tell us, given that there was no public objections in developing it, where is it with the state planning commission at this stage? And then I have a follow up question.

Anne: The state planning commission has been sitting on this for about two years. As you have suggested it is a very new idea for them to actually take a precinct plan like this and to approve it as a whole rather than it come up to them in various stages there has been a very long progress working through a range of stakeholders, stakeholders isn't probably the right word but organizations such as CALM, waters and rivers commission and the various shires and those kinds of things for their comments and there have been some negotiations around that. At the moment we have been sitting on about four changes of staff within the area that this plan is being moved through and we are so close but it hasn't happened. So it's still with the planning commission, and we feeling very frustrated by it.

(Unknown 3): The follow up question is that given the planning commission hasn't yet adopted it the people are probable not aware that that bit of land falls under the control of the state planning commission and not the two councils, are you aware of that?

Anne: I have to say I wasn't.

(Unknown 3): It's outside their planning scheme, it's a special area. I'm just a little concerned that some of the debate taking place, and I admire the comments about the integrity of the land around Tank Hill, but on the Kalamunda site all of this is actually in the shire of Kalamunda it's not actually in the shire of Mundaring. I had a discussion with the shire of Kalamunda this week and they were not aware that this was being proposed, they have already signed off that the water treatment plant is not going there, so they have shown no interest to date. But no mention

has been made yet of the ten hectares of land that has to be cleared on the Kalamunda site to put the drying beds. When the construction goes down there near the weir, but up there on the hill the drying beds have to be built to service it all in the shire of Kalamunda. I wonder if our learned gentleman here has done an assessment of that to make a similar comment perhaps that can be covered by Ken.

Colin: Will you touch on that issue Ken?

Ken: Yes.

Colin: We have gone a bit over time for this period; I would like to thank Anne for coming along and talking about this issue. We are a bit over time but I thought it better have those questions out and discussed. Ken is going to present briefly on some of the issues and perspective The Water Corporation have on some of these sites based on the criteria that was developed by this group.

Ken Walter: Originally I was going to speak for fifteen minutes or there about but I was asked the other day if I could cut it down to five I don't think I can do that now Colin. But simply starting off we have had many conversations from lots of people that are here tonight and others and I guess just one comment that I would like to make is that Miles if I can just thank-you for the input over last time and certainly it has put some of our planners and designers on making sure its more interactive, more educational and those sorts of things. Also in recent times Miles has come up with yet another site to consider which he has referred to O'Connor hill. There is actually two there is O'Connor hill, which is south of Firewood road and between McCallum road and Firewood road. Now at this present stage and Robert can do a bit more work on that, but at this stage, and Robert butt in if I'm wrong, that doesn't appear to offer any advantages on any of the other sites which we have. It's slightly more expensive and it does mean that there would be considerable destruction on forestry again but I will have a talk to you over that Miles because certainly it's not pristine as some of the other sites that we had been looking at.

Anne thank-you very much for your presentation tonight. We have been speaking to several people from The National Trust and a few different tourism groups and everything else; I think Anne presented that quite well. What I do have with me tonight, which I can hand out I think, is what I call a very draft of the executive summary of the fauna and flora surveys which the GHD people have done, so as soon as I have finished I will hand these out to the tables here. It talks about the DC land, the kilometer below the weir, site five and the pine plantation. I will hand those ones out.

The question was raised about the article in the newspaper about it says, 'Private Esperance Plant Moves to Take Over Goldfield's Water Supply.' As of Thursday after noon when I knocked off the government, the propose off and The West Australian had not even contacted The Water Corp for any comment on that article. The Water Corporation's point of view is quite simple, that we will take the water from anywhere as long as it's economical to do so. At this present stage it's far from economical to do so. That is separate from that article here that says 'A mediator has been appointed,' we don't know of a mediator and our enquires to the minister offices were certainly that they know nothing of it either. I don't really know anything about that article. If a developer can give us water for the same price as we are getting it to Kalgoorlie we will certainly buy it, there is no doubt

about that. Now if it did come what would that mean to the water treatment plant at Mundaring? Absolutely nothing in the long term, it may mean, and I think Robert you can answer a few questions here, the initial footprint could be smaller but that is really just about the only issue. They have buckles of getting up by 2009 anyway. If they are going through the same sort of vigorous process we have got to go through you people would understand that 2009 is not correct. Anyway from the Water Corps point of view we have no idea, certainly planning and all the studies that were announced previously this year was that the Water Corp and government wasn't going to consider the Esperance desalination plant any further.

What I would like to go onto, Robert if you would like to just go back to the first one, quite a bit of questions have been asked of me what The Water Corporations point of view is. What I'm going to do is a run through of what again my interpretation of what executive and government are thinking, it's my interpretation when we get down to the spread sheets, to what I and a few others which I have asked to fill out the spread sheet, think that you people will measure it. Now please don't take that on board as anything other than me just putting numbers on a bit of paper, but I had to put something down there to value how Robert's electronic wizardry can use your figures to play around. Certainly from The Water Corporations point of view going back to what we spoke about when Peter Moore was here about dollar figures. Colin adventurously got out of him that anything around about that 160 million he would be prepared to spend extra money to go up to there. So I have asked Robert to list them in dollar terms from I think eleven which we have got up there, with O'Connor hill thrown in at the present moment.

So what I would like to suggest from the start from The Water Corporations point of view is that a site anywhere near Chidlow's forget it. Site nineteen forget it, site seven forget it, and site three very, very close to forget it. And I think the intention of listening to people around here I think it's the intention of a vast majority of people is to forget it. It leaves in order site one below the weir, a kilometer below the weir, absolutely buckles chance of getting that being a national park. However on your criteria it's not essential it's important. Site two I reckon buckles chances there for tourism RPZ reasons and those sorts of issues. The DEC land is other than dollars there is very little impediment in that one. The pine plantation we have that RPZ again, the reservoir protection zone. O'Connor hill is what I was saying I guess Miles laid off the rank, but I don't consider it an option because of forestry and whatever. Then basically site four is just in is just out. Site five again I think everyone knows about that Sawyers Valley it's a national park we have a lot of objection from you people here, from the Water Corps point of view it is a national park, however we have said before in the second reading on Hansard it has got a chance of getting that one as far as national park is concerned.

Now looking at what we had before, the web, next one please. Now what I have done there is various people, have you all put in your criteria, so what we have done down here, tonight you will be asked to work through this worksheet. I have just gone through there and put figures in that suit me and I think get that down to a bit more detail in your syndicates later. As you can see we have the central criteria out of yours, the important criteria, then if you can put in the figures I put in and then you put in your own you will come up with another answer. All across the top there you can change those as much as you like. You will get those forms out there tonight. Basically what I am saying there is that it gives you two

answers. There is your straight un-weighted answer from the way you put it in, but you can say realistically that one is far more important than that one and Robert can change those figures with multiplier and come out with another answer out there. So for example the site at Chidlows came out with twenty-five points once you apply the weightings that we have artificially put in there at the moment and you can put in what ever weighting you like, it comes up to a thirty-eight figure there. So we can show you if you consider some of you criteria more than others and what it has on the actual effect if you do your maths. So that's all there Robert can do that on the computer tonight, so there are no mirrors or anything like that, he can do those sorts of things. The way it is scored there the higher number the better it is. But your facilitators will work you through that one.

(Unheard Question)

5x I think 7, 8, 540. Then you can weight them on however you like on that. I'm just showing you what you are doing tonight; your facilitators have all of that under control who will work through it individually with you.

For example with my figures, be aware they are my figures the red type colours in there are the un-weighted ones which comes out with the CALM land was the best in site seven. Then by the time we went through the complete weightings you can see that there was very little change in order. You can change those weightings around to however you like and you can look at the sensitivity of National park, you can look at the sensitivity of environment and all those sorts of things. That's just another way of looking at it. That has probably just confused the hell out of you, but Colin tells me the facilitators are all well aware, they have got the forms there and they're going to help you work through that to apply your criteria. So, are there any questions? I do want to make it quite clear I think we have to be quite realistic about the dollar terms as well.

Colin: You are probably rather confused about this; I'll try and explain it to you. Can I just take this opportunity to say if you have any specific questions you want to ask Ken we can take about three questions; at this stage we have four. I'm just aware that I have those who have already asked a question and I would rather those who haven't, so we have three at this stage. Yes Steve.

Steve: Just concerned regarding process quite frankly up to now we have had excellent presentations on history, we have had excellent presentations on the social and cultural history of a few of the key sites, we have had The Water Corporations' economic analysis with Peter Moore's dirty great big red line that what qualifies, what we don't have are environmental assessments. So we don't have the base triple bottom line to go on with. And if we are not working from a triple bottom line what are we working from?

Ken: I think if we go back the flow chart that I think was produced in forum two was to get to the community preferred sites and why. Can you grab that one again Steve, so we are very consistent with that process and we have stuck with it all along, we have been following it the whole way through and that is the process of getting a site. We are still right up here; down here it says the transparent of The Water Corporations process. We are still trying to get the communities ranking and reasons and that is where we are with that today, we are very consistent with that.

Colin: Can I just explain I think the confusion that comes here is that the purpose of the rating isn't to decide a site tonight. The purpose of the rating that Ken was purposing was to try to narrow that list of sites down to a smaller number of maybe three sites for more detailed analysis. It wasn't intended that the purpose tonight was to decide a site. It was to reduce that list down so that there are a smaller number of sites where that detail analysis can be done.

(Unheard Talking)

I think the idea is that you don't have it now, is that if we narrow done to a smaller number of sites, the corporation can do that more detailed analysis. The difficulty it faces now is to do that across eleven/twelve sites.

(Unheard Talking)

I understand that, but that sort of detail and assessment is very difficult to do over eleven sites, but it is easier to do if there are three or four sites that are clearly viable options. That was the intention of the intention to rate so we can narrow down to a smaller number of sites, not to decide. Steve asked a question, Ken do you want to touch on that again. No. Ok someone who hasn't asked a question.

Suzanne: Look it's an excellent question but the reality is that we are not going to do a full impact assessment on twenty-seven sites. We know and I think everyone in this room knows that there is really only a couple of sites that are realistically worth considering and that what the aim of tonight is, to get it down to those manageable sites. So when we are doing the rankings tonight and you are scoring it from one to five and your facilitators will explain this in a lot more detail, when you are looking at the scoring you will look at all the eleven sites we are looking at and it's based on what you know about the sites already. You know which ones have quality vegetation; you know which ones are in national parks for example so you would score them quite low. My recommendation if you don't know and you feel it may be a good site environmentally, like its covered in vegetation, and Ken will probable kill me for saying this, score it low. Score it low, on the absence of information act of the precautionary principal.

Colin: Any other questions from those who haven't asked a question. Yes up the back here. I did ask for someone that hadn't asked a question tonight. So Jenny.

Jenny Mills: I'm a part owner in the farm on site four. We have asked and asked the question I thought it was said if a property was not for sale you wouldn't consider it. Now you have site four sitting up there with a red line under it, obviously you are considering it and I think this is a question that has not been dealt with or answered fairly from The Water Corp.

Colin: Can I just comment on that because I think the issue of private property is one that keeps resurfacing. Now remember these are The Water Corporations views that the essential criteria that this forum had identified that any site on private property would not be considered. If that is the view of this forum that would mean that all private property would fall out.

(End of Tape one Side Two)

Ken: Let me repeat again what I have said. Is that we are not going to compulsory acquire land for the treatment plant. Full-stop. If this forum here says Mr. Water Corporation we want it to go on site what ever it is, and it's private land then I am going to have to go back to that land owner and says, 'will you sell it to me?' And if you don't then we go somewhere else again, I have said so many times. This is your forum, you tell us, look vote for it now. You tell us that all private land is out. Because people in the forum at the beginning asked it to be there.

Colin: Another issue there was that it wasn't up to the Water Corp to remove sites, that's this group's discussion. I think we have been saying that all along. If the criteria that have been developed is the basis of site selection, if the criteria that no private property is essential then your recommendation would be that no site be considered that is on private property. That's the point of this discussion to produce a recommendation from this group. But The Water Corporation has a view, but you don't have to agree with that view, this forum has made it very clear that it doesn't believe that the site should be on private property. My understanding of your recommendation about is the essential criteria. Yes Miles.

Miles: ...I have information on it can at some stage I just talk about it?

Colin: What Miles has said and he is right. The lists you have on your table list O'Connor hill as a site. What happened was the discussion that I had with the community advisory group, there was a suggestion as has been requested by the Water Corp if people had sites they would be suggested and the Water Corporation would look at it. Now that site was only suggested when I met with that forum three weeks ago and so the Corporation have not done a detailed assessment of that site as yet. But because it had been suggested it was included on that list, but I take your point that you don't have information about that site. I think in the context of tonight, I don't think that's the right thing to do. I want to deal with these issues so we can at least move forward with this process.

(Unknown): I have a little print out can I just put that on the table then?

Colin: Yes certainly we can distribute that. Yes Lois down the back.

Lois: As a part of a democratic robust process I would just like to thank the person who repeatedly asked for me to be gagged in public consultation periods. I appreciate that your openness and I would love your name. Anyway getting to a very quick point, Robert last week we talked about two things, knowing what the site would look like on the DC land and showing what the site would look like at Mundaring weir, so I'm interested to know if you could get that program together so that we can have a look at that tonight. I'm very interested in that. Another thing as your aware I don't participate on the tables each week, one of the reasons that I don't participate is I really do believe in democracy. I don't like being railroaded in a direction I don't want to go. I think tonight is a perfect example of that, we need more information to be able to make decisions. I'm very concerned about the documents that come out to us by Mr. Penter, after you have filled in all your little deliberative forms like good little people. And it doesn't cover what a lot of people say. I understand that someone here has asked for the crown solicitors or state solicitors to come along and give information about various things that has never happened. I repeated asked for various departments like CALM, forestry Products Commission, Water and Rivers, Conservation Commission.

Colin: Lois can you ask a question please.

Lois: My question is when we are going to get to a robust democratic process where every voice is heard and you start asking questions and presenting information that people ask for so they can make a decision. Tonight you are going to choose a site.

Colin: No there not. A couple of things there was no intention to choose a site, the intention is to narrow the list down for possible options for more assessment. The second question is, whatever is written on those workbooks is recorded is sent back, there is no adding, deleting or removal.

(Unheard Talk)

Colin: Yes certainly. What I said was that we are not choosing one site, the idea is to try and produce a longer list of sites down to a smaller number that will enable us to do a detailed assessment that people have been asking. The issue The Corporation has raised it is very difficult to do those detailed assessments on sites that are not from their point of view or others points of view, viable or realistic. The idea is to narrow it down to a number of sites, not decide one site that is what I was trying to say. I think he was suggesting showing one opinion and how it could be done.

(Unknown): If you are true to your word in saying there is no intention to choose a site...

Colin: Not choose one site. No, not choose a preferred site, it's to narrow the list down so they can be assessed in more detail.

(Unknown): I made a couple of notes tonight, but I don't have them here with me, I may be able to produce them from my own memory, but this National Heritage Trust which was on this power-point presentation, that the goals were to conserve and protect the heritage of the Mundaring weir water body that exists. Then under that it was to enhance the economic, social and tourist values of the area. Why did the environmental values get admitted from that?

Colin: Well I guess the National Trust would have to answer that question. I don't know.

(Unknown): How is this for something mate, aren't the environment values reliable on this whole water treatment operation to be carried out successfully?

Anne: I think what Anne was presenting was with the goals of The National Heritage Trust obviously golden pipeline program. Not necessarily its goals for this water treatment plant. Would that be correct Anne?

(Unknown): Oh I'm sorry I thought I came to a water treatment plant meeting.

Colin: You have and what you had was a presentation from the National Trust.

(Unknown): Well that is just one note that I take. Who is speaking about the kids you know, isn't this all about the people who are going to be served by this whole treatment plant?

Colin: Is that a question or a statement, I don't know. I can't answer that.

(Unknown): Well is it for the adults of this day or for the kids of the future.

Colin: I think you have a fair question, I think that there is other people would like to ask a question, we are getting along way ahead of time. Well there is question here, there is a question there.

(Unknown): All I'm trying to say is I think I may be other than the person there that is getting employed to sit on his ass the youngest person in this room.

Colin: Sure I take your point.

(Unknown): And from sitting here before he didn't seem quite interested in hearing what was being said and it might not of been because what you guys were saying wasn't very interesting or the fact that he is getting paid to sit and make sure..

Colin: You are also assuming that people here aren't concerned about young people; they probably have children as well.

(Unknown): My concerns are very important and what you said the intention here tonight is not about selecting a site, it's about promoting these sites that are out there they may be chosen eventually.

Colin: Can I suggest that someone other be allowed to ask a question, you have had a fair go. Ok just here.

(Unknown 2): Suzanne my question is to you and again I'm sorry I have been away for the last two forums so I may have missed something I'm not sure. You said there is no way you can do a detail assessment of all those sites, absolutely granted, but one extreme to the other have you done a scant table, preparing vegetation, how many km or acres. Have you done anything?

Suzanne: Megan may be better at asking that one. We have done some fauna and flora surveys as well as some aboriginal heritage work.

(Unknown 2): I know we are going around and around in circles Colin, but my question still is how do we eliminate a site given environmental criteria when we have seen nothing scant or otherwise. It actually just puts them along side each other.

Suzanne: The was some information presented last forum, but can you reverse what you are thinking about doing tonight and instead of thinking about choosing a site think about eliminating sites that aren't feasible. If you think about it that way it seems a whole lot simpler.

Colin: There was some mentioned last week a summary of site by site break down, plus there was opportunities for people visit sites and look at some of those issues. Part of those issues were to I guess is that The Corporation is saying a detailed assessment is really best done once you have got a smaller number of sites that can be looked at in more detail.

(Unknown): Yes I won't go on, but I think that Ken has done I think we need the same thing. I'm aware it is one criteria, but it is a important one where we go environmentally

preparing vegetation on the water way, dieback invested etc. and I may have missed it so I apologise.

Suzanne: Yes well look you can kind of do it quite crudely as well for example The National Parks out. That may be a criteria for the groups you score that low, you see what I mean. But I think Annette said I don't think everyone is quite clear, that's what I'm saying it should be all played out so its apples against apples. Not economically we have had a bottom line drawn somewhere.

Colin: Beth hasn't asked a question and I think the gentleman down the back has been trying so Beth after you the gentleman just here.

Beth: Can we cross off our list the sites that are too expensive and won't be considered, that will take off four straight away. Can we cross off the private property were the owners refuse to sell then we can probably go home.

Colin: Thanks Beth that in a sense was the purpose of what we are trying to do. As Suzanne said, to eliminate those that is simply not feasible, so some of that more detailed assessment that you quite rightly need can be done. The gentleman here you have been trying for a while.

(Unknown): That's Ok just have a specific question about the acquisition of the CALM site. \$145 000 estimated capital cost does that include any acquisition cost or relocation cost? Is the Water Corporation involved in the relocation of CALM, the cost?

Ken: The answer is two fold yes and no, we have had lengthy discussion with CALM if we go back about two years CALM said without using the expletives 'No Way' since then, and Mike might be able to add a bit more to it, since then they have actually come up with and I'm not sure if it is their district plan but it is basically a plan, what CALM need in the future at that site is an office and lay down areas, parking areas, fire fighting equipment things like that. The office which they have at the present moment is inadequate and they need a new office. A portion of that has been put into this funding, but on the same basis the purchase of the land has not necessarily been put in there because we will buy that land and in affect give them other land in exchange which we own. So as far as if you like a cost to the corporation is concerned it hasn't been allowed for, but as far as cost to the government has been concerned, yes it has been. Do you understand what I'm saying with the book keeping side of it? And at this stage some of the discussions I have been having with CALM at the present moment I think it is far to say their expectations of their offices is a little bit different then my expectations of their new office.

Colin: Ok there is a gentleman here that hasn't asked a question and Sandra hasn't asked a question.

(Unknown): Is there any other position for the drying beds for site one, other than in the forest, can you find another bed that doesn't pick out good forest?

Ken: Yes, the forest itself there is in the national park, it's in the shire of Kalamunda; there is a pine plantation further up the hill which could be considered. If we are looking at we would have to look everywhere again for the drying beds it could be on the CALM site, it could be anywhere but at this present stage engineering and

the cost wise we have done that is on the south side up the hill and initially the plan Robert showed of the national park as my understanding is the most like would be in the pine plantation further up that road. When we get down to detailed analysis for example if site one is one of those ones which is on the further detailed analysis we have a lot of work to do even the issue of getting a chlorine license for an area down there may be difficult and we may have to take the chlorine component of the treatment plant somewhere as well, but that is an issue that no one in the licensing would even talk to us about, we wouldn't have a chance in hell if we were talking about seven sites but we might have a chance if we are talking about two or three.

Colin: We need to take a couple more then wind it up, Sandra hasn't asked a question then I will come to Max unless there is anyone else that hasn't asked a question who would like to. I just want to get people who haven't asked a question Neil.

Sandra: Can I just quickly ask because I think it's important, Ken that site that you said is in the reservoir protection zone I can't remember what number it was now, if I look up my map I will see it.

Ken: The pine plantation is in RPZ, site two the rose garden type area is in RPZ and I think that was it.

Sandra: What about all this National Trust precinct plan isn't that in RPZ?

Ken: No national park is the RPZ that they are talking about at the present moment, is not for the presentation which was given a few forums back from The Department of Water. They were only looking at an RPZ for the Mundaring catchment not the lower Helena catchment at this stage. It will come but there is so much degradation in the lower Helena catchment that the chance of RPZ.

Sandra: So all that National Trust area, the golden pipeline area isn't in the reservoir protection zone, is that what you are saying?

Ken: Anything that is downstream from the weir, no but where the pipeline goes through actually into the catchment and it is within two kilometers of the water body that would be the case, but I don't think it would be the case.

Sandra: So all of that plan The National Trust presents it, is that in the reservoir protection zone?

Ken: If it is below the weir definitely not.

Colin: Is that your question Sandra?

Sandra: So none of that area down there..

Colin: Anything that is below the weir is not in the reservoir protection zone.

Sandra: It blows my mind.

Colin: Neil quickly then Max.

Neil: Ken this is really for the National Trust as well, in this map of the site below the weir would you still have been so against it and Ken is this going to continue that we are working with different sets of plans and rules, there is one set for you people and another set for everyone else and also The National Trust who seem to get everything right anyway.

Ken: What date is that plan there?

Neil: This one is dated 9/12/99. Well if you have something else for us I would certainly like to see it.

Ken: I'll call on Robert to help us out there, Robert?

Robert: The map that you have is from the last investigation for the sites for the treatment plan. Basically the arrangement does not change very much but the allocated areas there is slightly different. What we have tried to do to ensure that the area is sufficient for the treatment plant. The one that you have from 1999 should be roughly the size of the area for the main treatment plant infrastructure the treatment/ drying bed will not fit in that area additional to that. What you have there is good representation of what the treatment plant site below the weir will look like.

Neil: So I could give a copy of this to The National Trust and they could work with this?

Robert: Yes, that would be a reasonable representation of a proposed treatment plant down below the weir looks like.

Neil: Thank-you.

Colin: Last Max Williams has been trying this, after this we will take a five minute break.

Max: Ken the question to you is that I'm just a little concerned about what emphasis to give to this RP Zone and I'm follow up the question that was asked a moment ago, that reservoir protection zone has not yet been gazetted has it, it has not yet been put into any statute, it's only just been talked about?

Ken: It's part of government policy but at this stage..

Max: I wonder if everyone else would just be quite so I can hear the answer.

Ken: There was a presentation Max two forums ago from The Department of Water and without doubt we would be really struggling to get their approval, we wouldn't get their approval to go into it. So if we had to go into an area within the RPZ then it would have to be a political decision.

Max: So if this community recommended to you through this weighted program that the plantation site that is not an environmental site is the one that should happen that this theoretical RPZ that you would find as an impediment?

Ken: The answer is no, I wouldn't agree with that.

Max: The only reason I'm asking are we asking is Ken, are we wasting our time, dealing with a site if the RPZ is ruled out.

Ken: I firmly believe we would have absolutely no chance of getting approval to go on a RPZ site and that is my reading of government. I also believe we would have no chance whatsoever of going to national park a kilometer below the weir. I also believe we would have buckles chance of coming up for recommendation of anything which is in excess of 160 million on those figures. If this groups recommend that they want to go for a more expensive one on private land I'm obliged to put that forward, but I don't think you would have any chance of getting it.

Colin: Can I suggest we take a five minute break then we will come back just to move to the next faze. Thank-you.

(Break)

Colin: Ok, we just had an accident, they just slipped over but you will be pleased to know they have come back and joined us again. Thanks again for coming back and continuing in this faze. As you can tell we have gone a fair way away from tonight's schedule but at the same time it was important to have some of those questions on the table. The difficulty we have got that we have now got to 9pm with only a limited amount of time before this forum finishes. What I have had to do is make some sort of executive decision that the time we have really do this rating now and discuss it is adequate for the importance of it, so I'm therefore not willing to do it tonight. I hope that sits comfortably. What I would ask for the final half hour that if we are going to consider and I take the point about semantics but the intention is to remove sites and try and develop some sites for more detailed assessment. I take the point that a couple of people raised that is semantics, but it wasn't the intentions to choose a site. Well I guess my question would be and I'm keen to hear your views about this and I know I have had a couple of people raise it with me already, if in the November forum we did move down a process to eliminate sites and attach some rating to some sites to come to a smaller number of sites and there is no fixed view whether that's two, three or four, what is it that you would need to enable you to do that at the November forum. So I guess I would be interested in if, except we can't do that now, but we do it in November. There are a couple of points already raised with me; one is that the form is terribly confusing, so that needs some improvement. It was Miles who raised the issue of the O'Connor hill site and he's concerned that you haven't had information on that site so he would like the opportunity to provide some information on that site. There may be other issues that we need to address in order to do a similar process in November. I would ask if that is acceptable to you that we won't go down this path in the last twenty-five minutes, but you tell The Water Corp and me what you would need in order to start that in November. Does that seem a reasonable way to use our last twenty-five minutes? Yes, perhaps Steve, we will take the microphone around, if we do this in November what do you need in order for it to be done effectively. Yes, Bev.

Bev: I repeat my suggestion and I hope I have the support of people here, take off the list all of those sites that the Water Corp say are so expensive that they won't be considered. Why are we considering them if they won't be considered. And second take off those properties that the owners say they won't sell.

Colin: Ok, what you are suggesting Beth just so I'm clear is actually the document that actually comes back to you to give you some rating removes those sites that are

on private property and remove those where the owners won't sell, ok. I notice that the heads nodding and the applause that that is a reasonable so that this document that comes back to you any private property given the fact you identified that as essential. And the other point you made Beth any above the cost are you happy for that to be done. Sorry Max?

Max: I'm just worried about the price because that is simply the Water Corps view, another view is that a \$160 million site is the right site and we should argue politically for the extra money. So putting a line saying nothing above that value, doesn't give us the choice. Maybe at two hundred million maybe we could rule out.

Colin: Well I guess some of them would fall out because they are private property anyway, less just go around and see where it takes us Lois down the back then we will come over to just here.

Lois: All private land and all national parks, what someone wants it in a national park?

Colin: Well I guess there is no reason it couldn't come back to that in the end, with some deduction with certain criteria.

Lois: Site five is a national park, take it out. Site four that is peoples homes take it out.

Colin: Remember that this forum identified that as an important not an essential criteria.

Lois: Obviously because a lot of people in this room like to bull doze trees rather than pick degraded land.

Colin: Lois democracy is about getting the view of majority of the people, but this group did endorse as an important but not an essential criteria. That wasn't the Water Corp or my decision that was what this group suggested. That's not to say the national parks can't come out when we do the detailed assessment. We are just talking about material coming back for the next forum. Any other comments, yes just here.

(Unknown): Can we in the next forum only include the sites that actually are feasible, so for whatever reason, if it's a Water Corp reason because they decide that this site is really not feasible take them off the list for what ever reason. Because we don't want to decide on things then Ken says look we will never get that through, so the ones he has already mentioned are probable not feasible, either put them in light print you know.

Colin: The Water Corporations view is just that, their view. That may not be the view that you share.

(Unknown): No but it is more than a view, he knows some site are just not going to be feasible, it's just not possible to get that through.

Colin: But this is a forum for the community to make its recommendations, taking into account the Water Corporations views, but not necessarily to be dictated by them.

(Unknown): I'm not saying as a view, but the ones that we really think aren't feasible. Anything that's not feasible.

Colin: Well I guess we have some criteria that this group has developed it's probably best that this group apply those criteria to eliminate those sites.

(Unknown): If the Water Corp knows they aren't feasible then we shouldn't waste our time.

Colin: I suppose cost is one of those issues, but I think we need some solid basis for someone removing some of those sites for you, because part of the work next forum is to try to remove some and then narrow down to a smaller number.

(Unknown): Well for a start I think the ones above the red line, and I would remove site four as well because we know there have been major objections. O'Connor hill it is to late and we don't have enough information at this stage.

Colin: Miles has offered to give it, I think all along the invitation has been for people to offer sites if they believe they are viable and I think we need to consider that site.

(Unknown): Well maybe down to O'Connor hill and remove site four, couldn't we have a show of hands?

Colin: Well I think that is more for next forum, I think what we need to do now is clarify what you need to do to do that for next forum.

(Unknown): To expedite it you could almost have a show of hands.

Colin: No I don't want to have a vote now at nearly 9:10pm.

(Unknown): You could remove those ones at the bottom in about five minutes if we had a show of hands.

Colin: The issue is if this process is going to stand up to scrutiny its going to need to be rigorous and documented. Is there someone else that needs to comment on what you need to be able to do this next forum, yes down the back.

(Unknown2): Isn't this after all a community hall?

Colin: Well the question relates to what will help us to do the work next week, so that is what I want questions on if you could.

(Unknown2): When I think of the term community forum I think of the ability for members of the community to express their view as community members.

Colin: Well I think that's what people have been doing, as you have as well.

(Unknown2): I don't want any conflict here, but as you didn't answer my question I'm going to keep on talking.

Colin: I have a specific purpose for this session, I am happy to talk to you after about this question.

(Unknown2): I want to talk to the forum mate.

Colin: This is a specific question that relates to how we can do the work next. Now if you don't have a question about that other people do.

(Unknown2): I do have a question, and I don't want this meeting to extend to 9:30pm.

Colin: Well could you phrase your question or comment then.

(Unknown2): Are you guys happy then with the existence then of a treatment plant and if you are, are you happy knowing that you are happy that you have made a difference.

Colin: I can't answer that. Yes over here, Professor Bolton.

Pr. Bolton: I am a blow in and it's not fair that I impose any solutions on this group but it did seem to me that the lady who thought we could eliminate some of the contenders was making good sense. I think it would concentrate your minds a good deal in November if you knew seriously that sites you are going to be considering are number one the CALM land including the airstrip and possibly O'Connor hill and if I have missed the sense to this meeting and other people want to add to that so be it. But I think it would make a much more coherent if you narrowed it down to three or four.

Colin: Well I guess I can't do that but I can try to facilitate a process so that is done by the forum.

Pr. Bolton: Well possible the meeting would resolve in the terms that that lady just indicated.

Colin: Yes sure. Yes the women up the back.

(Unknown3): Ken would you be willing to expand on the information we have been given about the two new sites? Can you expand a little on that for us? O'Connor hill on your views.

Ken: I have been out there since Miles has been around, it might be worth if Miles does give a five minute on it, if that what you people want. I guess the issue that we have with that is from an engineering point of view the best spot is above the tanks or below the weir from an engineering point of view, otherwise you need extra pump stations and those sorts of things and I think that's where Robert comes from. The CALM depot site for example is close to the weir but it's a fall back position from the pure straight engineering, like extra pipes, extra pump stations and things like that. The area between Firewood road and McCallum road and the area just below Firewood road as my understanding is O'Connor hill are the same engineering concepts as CALM depot. On the surface of it there are two different, if you compare those two there, CALM depot is closer to the weir, so from Roberts point of view is a cheaper solution. From me the CALM depot is a better point of view because we aren't cutting down very many indigenous type trees compared to what there is at O'Connor hill. The other place if you walk through the wood lands there either side of firewood road and I can only admit I have only spent four hours trudging through there. Yes there are some imported species of trees there, yes its fairly sparse, its definitely not as pristine forest as other areas around, but it's still we are cutting down more trees and things for an area like the CALM site for example that we don't have to do. In dollars terms from my point of view from the little knowledge I've had from it there is no advantage to the CALM site next to it. Miles.

Colin: Miles I don't want to open this up for debate but I might just make a comment. We need to clearly to provide this information to a broad audience but have a quick comment about this site.

Miles: How quick is quick. I'll just talk you through the bit of paper. Just on the left hand side it says heritage and landscape issues, what I'm trying to illustrate that all the sites near the weir are bit like trying to get a large size person in a small chair, they don't really fit and they over lap. Below the weir is in a beautiful valley in site one and it over laps into that valley and so you look down on it and it's not going to look very nice. Site two we have quietly forgotten about the pine plantation is along way away. The CALM site has a lot of heritage issues that haven't been addressed it goes back to 1882. Up the side here there are the costs and the community impact going north. We have all this information about private land and impacting on Sawyers Valley and all that kind of stuff. So this one is trying to say head south and this one is trying to say head north, if you do both of those you end up in this area in the middle of the map.

(End of Tape 2, side 1)

Miles: ...Took to the meeting and thought look like a good site. Then there is B, which is a bit further north. So working up from the bottom, I know this takes five minutes I practiced, working up from the bottom below the weir, that's out. You have the site below the weir that seems to be very unpopular. You have the pine plantation that seems to be unpopular, site two seems to be unpopular. Working from the top you have other sites up there, tank hill which is still on the table, other sites are over 160 000. So this leaves us in this kind of area with the CALM site which we just had a quite positive slant on and this other area here. I think the CALM site has a lot of heritage value, I think like the speaker over here was saying it could be part of that general recreational, residential area. Going onto site a, you think because it's on top of hill, but we don't live in the Himalayas or the Andes, we don't live where there are pointy hills, we live where there are flat hills on the top. The hill goes up like that then flattens off to a plateau. If you were to put it up there you could just tuck it over the ridge. You have loads of space, you could fit it in within existing trees between existing geographical features it would make really nice feature of it. The same thing with site B, you can spread it out as much as you like that's what I'm saying. You have unlimited space to make it creative. You could chop down any significant trees. It's off firewood road, so it was obviously firewood, most of its trees of this size. You could fit it around all the existing good trees; it seems to me like a good site. Thank-you.

Colin: I think there is a lot more information you clearly need but I don't want to open it up now.

Miles: There is enough space so you can set it back so it won't be seen from any road and there is enough space so you could landscape it so when you are inside it you could hardly see it because we would landscape it.

Colin: As Ken said even The Water Corporation hasn't had a lot of time to look at this site and that clearly needs to be done. I guess what I'm interested in is in the last ten minutes is there any other issue that needs to be clarified to enable some removal of sites from consideration and identification of smaller number sites at

the November forum. Yes just here and then over here. I would rather go with people that haven't.

(Unknown4): Colin it's just that I'm a very visual person and I thought it might help others, it certainly would help me, I know Ken has put some of the information together, if we could have around the whole site, if we could have boards around the room. Site one with the price etc. And space to actually write on if we know something about the environmental aspect. So people can walk around and find out that information I would find that useful I don't know if anyone else would.

Colin: Yes, that is something hopefully the corporation will look at.

(Unknown5): I think it would be helpful if we were going to consider O'Connor hill to include the property owners adjacent to Firewood Road who currently have no input into this forum because at the moment it doesn't impact directly on them. I think they would be quite interested seeing they are building their new residence on top of the hill adjacent from Firewood road and it's a beautiful hill from their future front verandah. So if we were going to continue with O'Connor hill at the next forum.

Colin: Just over here.

(Unknown6): My question is directed at Ken. In the event of the Esperance desalination plant getting up that would supply water to Kalgoorlie and reduce the need the volume of water to come from this direction, you said it would have no impact on the WPT but it might leave a smaller footprint, now would that reduce the size needed to establish a WPT and would it also reduce the cost and would it also change the order of side options perhaps.

Ken: A very good question. To a large extent very difficult to answer with a straight answer. The Water Corporation and government have already been through the process of looking at the issues of supplying desalinated water from Esperance. Government treasury said it's not on. That's our position at the present moment so therefore we need to plan for a water treatment plant in Mundaring. I did say there would be the potential for a smaller footprint in the short term. There are many issues in taking water from the Esperance issue, the policy that they are trying to sell the water as a take or leave so therefore if they want to sell us twelve gigs and we can only take six gigs over a year we have got to pay for twelve otherwise it's not economic for them to do it. The issue is if Kalgoorlie industry say they can take ten but only take two then do we take the other ten down our way then if that's the case we have several billion dollars worth of infrastructure which automatically becomes redundant so under accounting rules that is a cost we have to bare as well. At this stage from the water corporations point of view it is a very highly unlikely scenario and it certainly won't be by 2009.

Colin: Are there any other comments or questions from anyone that hasn't had the opportunity to raise a question or make some comment about what we need in order to start looking at narrowing these sites down next forum. Then I'll go to Lois and Neil if you would. Then we will finish it up.

Lois: I'll make it quick, as the only descending voice at this forum, I would like the National Trust, Conservation Council and the Environmental Officer of The Water Corporation to explain at the next forum why they think that a water treatment plant is highly suited in a national park. Because you have stated that it's not an

essential requirement by every person in this room that national parks be excluded. You pointed that out to me, you said we lived in a democracy; I'm the descending voice, everybody in this room is happy to leave a water treatment plant in a national park.

Colin: No, what people have said is that that for them is important criteria but not essential criteria simply to try and apply in narrowing site down.

Steve: Lois, I'm representative from the Conservation council we are a non government, non-profit, community based organization of environment groups. We have no say whatsoever in determining where a water treatment plant goes any more than anyone else at this forum does. We are not part of a government department; we have no statutory power whatsoever. So I think you were referring to perhaps another government organization, I'm just making it quite clear that Conservation Council has not endorsed putting a water treatment plant in a national park and never would.

Suzanne: I just want to respond to your request Lois that I as the environment officer at the Water Corporation in the state why I would be acceptable in a national park. I don't believe it would be appropriate for me to do that because I am not part of the community forum I work for the Water Corporation.

Neil: I think we should now there, we have gone on about this a little bit too much I think, we should of made the decision that it is essential that the water treatment plant isn't built in a national park upgrade our feelings on it that it has been good enough for the government to actually say it's a national park, it therefore has a great deal of significance, lets upgrade it.

Suzanne: If that is what this forum comes to in its deliberation then that is what we will take that to the government, it's not for The Water Corporation people to exclude sites. I think that is the purpose of tonight for you guys to exclude sites but if being in national parks is an absolutely essential criteria then rule it out.

Colin: Now that was the nature of the allocation of some priority to some criteria. If this forum collectively sorts that as important/essential that was what we did over the last couple of forums.

(Unheard Talking)

Colin: Lois, I think it is unreasonable to suggest that was the reason people made that decision.

Max: Ken can I just remind everyone that right at the beginning Water Corp were challenged about why they were leaving sites out. The community demanded every single site on the table so the community could access whether they were valuable or not. It's a strange/ bizarre twist of logic that after seven or eight meetings that the Water Corp takes them out, it is our job to take them out and at the next forum when we do the assessment I have absolutely no doubt that sound sensible thinking people with their criteria will rule out those sites. This is not the way it should be done with hands in the air, it's got to stand by adjudication with the government later that we will properly assess those and rule them out.

- Colin: Thank-you that is an important point Max has raised about standing to some adjudication down the track so we need to work through some process that process quite rightly should and has been open to criticism all through this process. We, myself, syndicate group facilitators and the corporation have respond best we could to continuously revise this format to address those concerns. I know that has been very frustrating for a lot of people who want to move quicker, but at the same time Max's point is very true that that has been an important requirement to me to ensure that this process can stand up to critic further down the track and wasn't just a haphazard decision that this would be the preferred site. So that has been a critical decision. I'm more than happy for people to criticize the process. I'm just aware of time its 25 past, I would just like to conclude what we have got to is that there are a number of tasks that need to be met and they have been recorded in the transcript. In order that in the November forum this group will have the opportunity to remove sites that it believes aren't viable or feasible and begin to narrow some of those sites down. In order for you to do that process there are some things that it has been asked the corporation to do. I think now is not the time to open this up again, it's 9:30pm we need to conclude if there are particular speakers and you have specific people I am happy for you to suggest those. They may not be available; they may not be able to be here but please suggest them.
- Max: Last question, could Water Corp for the next meeting have an aerial photograph of those sites on the wall to have a look at.
- Colin: That request has been made I don't know if it will possible, I think they are saying yes. Can I ask you very much for your patience and commitment. These processes are never easy and I appreciate all your commitment and your willingness to express a view, sorry I didn't see that.
- (Unknown): As there were 76% of people at the last forum that had agreed that we could use the criteria we had come up with at this meeting is it necessary to wait an entire month to have the next meeting by the criteria that 76% of people have already agreed could be applied.
- Colin: Well I think you are asking the corp. a lot of info together in order to facilitate that process that is a time consuming task. In order to do that in less, and remember they have to get that information out to you in advance and that process takes a couple of weeks. What I have suggested is a date and it is in the workbook and I think the feasibility of going ahead at this stage is difficult. I think the Corporation needs time to put this together. I'm happy to talk to you afterwards but I think it's time to finish up. The date is on the workbook.