

PROPOSED WATER TREATMENT PLANT SITE SELECTION DELIBERATIVE FORUM PARTICIPANT WORKBOOK FEEDBACK FROM FORUM NOVEMBER 2006

This Workbook has been prepared by the Independent Facilitator to enable participants to provide direct feedback to the Water Corporation. The information will provide a record of participants' views and help plan future forums.

FILTERING SITES FOR MORE DETAILED ASSESSMENT (FIRST CUT ONLY)

Please indicate your views about the filtering and assessment process used this evening.

	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I had enough information to filter and assess sites	8	13		3	2
The process used this evening to filter and assess sites was clear	3	16	1	5	1
The process used to filter and assess sites worked well	4	11	2	6	3 (we will see)
The process used to filter and assess sites was fair	6	17		2	1

Please comment about the process used this evening.

Comments

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on O'Connor site was a bit limited • Sites 1, Dec and Pine plantation are the only sites to be considered at all future Forums. I have still to vote on tonight's Forum • Does the WC now agree that there is and never has been a Ministerial directive that the WTP should not be at the Weir? • Is it still the WC opinion that Mundaring Council was/is "totally opposed" to the Weir sites? If so I shall pursue the matter with the Council and report back • Is the WC going to act on my request 2 months ago for a State Solicitor opinion on the meaning of the WC Act? If not I shall follow up with the Crime and Corruption Commission and report back • I would like an answer urgently on these 3 questions above and would the questions responded to in the papers. The answers can be given to me by phone if this is more convenient, but the answers should also be incorporated in the Forum papers • Most confusing. Could have been explained better in first instance by a fully worked example • O'Connor site has not had enough consideration • The process itself was disrupted by the same group as in previous meetings • Not fair process because those who have lasted the distance of the Forum had already predetermined that - no private land to be used (self interest in several cases) and environmental interest groups simply totally opposed to any forest land being cleared • Needed information on Aboriginal significance of site. • Once a few points (e.g. "least" V 1-5 rating) were clarified it was very easy. Some people just don't think and read and try to drag these forums out. Most have since reached a fair decision • Syndicate groups work well. Forum questions dysfunctional

- The process was clear enough to allow Water Corporation to make a decision on a suitable site
- Well explained. Simple enough
- Not enough on O'Connor site; no information on O'Connor site
- Huge room for error
- Participants are in the main voting from a very personal perspective and this does not give an inclusive community evaluation. This is not just a vocal minority decision. It has whole of community and statewide impacts (not considered by this biased forum)
- How effective this process proves to be lies in the future. The system could have been explained better with less words
- Process was unwieldy and difficult to apply
- It was confusing- as it was very noisy it was very hard to concentrate
- Pine plantation has an Indigenous Australian registered site that I was unaware of when I considered the pine plantation site
- Although I ticked agree in most of the boxes I have to admit that I was really confused but may be I like to see things clear cut
- Tonight's process was long winded and there must have been a better way to do it
- Still awaiting previous questions asked of the Water Corporation
- The functioning and success of such a process will be reflected in whether the information is actually going to be used as an integral part of the transition to the next step. Will it be disregarded for other unidentified criteria
- Disappointed that the issue of non-attendees and how they were involved in the decision making process had not been determined prior to the meeting

The result of tonight's filtering and assessment of possible sites will be analyzed by the Water Corporation and fed back to participants. Those sites identified for more detailed assessment will also be analyzed by the Water Corporation and the information will be presented back to the Forum for further deliberation about a preferred site (s) in 2007.

Is there any further information needed and/or issues that still require attention by the Water Corporation?

- No
- Yes, status of Aboriginal sites
- No
- If the O'Connor site becomes a preferred site the Forum should definitely be given more information and a bus ride to view the site
- Comment from Indigenous people re sites for more detail. When they are a smaller number so I understand the implications of the decisions I may make. It was important to talk to Mr Yarran re sites
- Where would the footprint be on DEC (CALM) land? Near cinema or native vegetation to north or on hill above road?
- No
- Site 1 could have a definite drying bed site in the pine plantation
- Site boundaries seemed to have moved. All criteria must be frozen otherwise the assessment is meaningless
- I would like to hear more details on how the Water Corporation plan to use the chosen site which would include more detail on construction of the treatment plant and why this requires the 25 hectares of land that is requested
- Indigenous issues
- How will the United utilities desalination plant in Esperance affect the need for this WTP? It Has been repeatedly stressed that the need for the WTP is to provide Kalgoorlie with water. Will there still be a need for a WTP? If WC considers there is where will this volume of WTP water be directed then?

- Detailed plan of how the plant drying beds fit on each site and works to run surplus water away
- A 3D elevation of each site also vital especially for the DEC/CALM site and Site 1
- O'Connor site- no information available
- This appears to be an emotive and selfish outcome by participants

Are there speakers that still should present information to the Forum?

- I think the Water Corporation "pitch" for sites would be useful ie. what is really feasible
- No
- Shire of Kalamunda, Shire of Mundaring, Mundaring Tourism Association, Mundaring Historical Society
- No
- No
- Independent environmentalist
- I would like to hear Aboriginal opinion of the 3 favored sites
- I would like the WC to have an engineer present – the exact WTP plans and how they will be set out.

FORUM PROGRESS

	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I have felt able to express my views in the syndicate group	5	13	6		1
I feel we made real progress tonight	8	12 (for the last two)	3	1	
I feel the whole Forum process has been worthwhile	5	14	2		3

Comments

- There is still a disruptive element that appears wishing to derail the process. It is getting hard to keep motivated.
- Too slow
- Only a very small interest group has been involved in the process which did not warrant these 9 Forums
- Process seems to be very long and at times the Forum was made very unpleasant by noisy and very aggressive questions.
- Question time was again used to disrupt
- Thank you for e-mailing the information earlier
- Worked individually mostly in syndicate groups. Good questions from the floor- were they recorded?
- The process has been exceedingly tedious and repetitive
- Process very drawn out. Minority groups had too much input
- Still slow but at least something got done tonight
- No discussion in the individual syndicate groups. Hard to know if progress has been made- depends on how it is used. Will it be? If so then there was a purpose and a progress
- While I feel the private property issue should have been HONESTLY resolved very early so that some people's anxieties were also resolved quickly to make wise decisions I feel that the WC and Colin have put in a lot of time and work

