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Purpose and preparation of this report

The purpose of this report is to capture the main views expressed at the Community Dialogue Forum held in Harvey on 22 July 2006. The Forum was attended by nearly 200 people comprised of:

- Self nominees from a random survey of 7,000 people from the WA Electoral Commission electoral role;
- Respondents to media advertising (radio and paper); and
- invited stakeholders.

This report has been written by a project team made up of participants from the Forum.

All participants at the Dialogue Forum were invited to become part of the project team. There were thirty three nominees; seven were available to contribute to the preparation of this report in the identified timeframe. Selection also considered the background of nominees to ensure no single view dominated. All nominees were invited to comment on a draft of this report prior to its completion.

Project team members each identified key issues from the Forum before meeting on 23 August 2006 to agree on issues they considered represented the ‘Findings from the Forum’. A number of draft reports were prepared and distributed by email for comment before a final meeting on 1 September 2006.

The project team considered all aspects of the Forum including:

- the views of all participants;
- presentations from invited experts;
- the deliberative survey results;
- participant feedback form results; and
- electronically (laptop) recorded data.

The electronically recorded data comprised the input from all 25 tables at the Forum. This input was reviewed and grouped into similar, recurring issues (something that could not be done at the Forum given the time constraints of the day). Grouping the data helped the project team consider all views held at the Forum.

This report and other information on the Community Dialogue Forum is available on the Department’s website at http://drinkingwater.water.wa.gov.au select ‘Logue Brook Dam’ under the ‘Projects’ heading.
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Appendix

1. Participant comments from each table, including:
   - Worksheet 1: Our values – What is most important to you about this issue?
   - Session 1: Should Government policy be re-examined so that some recreation is allowed in and around drinking water dams?
   - Session 2: Should the Logue Brook Dam proposal go ahead? If it does, and assuming recreation is prevented from continuing, what recreation opportunities do you think need to be developed at other dams in the Waroona and Harvey area?

Findings from the Forum
1. Summary and Findings

A Dialogue Forum was held in Harvey on 22 July 2006, to engage the community in South West (Waroona and Harvey) Water Catchment Management issues. The Forum also provided information on a specific proposal submitted by Water Corporation and Harvey Water to trade water. The proposed trade, in part, involves Logue Brook Dam (Figure 1), known to locals as ‘Logues’, an existing ‘irrigation and recreation’ dam enjoyed by tens of thousands of people each year for activities such as camping, skiing, swimming, fishing, boating, bush walking and off road vehicle uses (two and four wheel). If approved, this proposal could see Logues closed to many of these existing recreational uses and managed for ‘irrigation and drinking water supply’ purposes.

The Forum was asked to consider two key issues:

- Current government policy, which would restrict recreation at Logue Brook Dam if it was used as a public drinking water supply dam; and
- What opportunities existed to replace/relocate recreation from Logue Brook Dam elsewhere in Harvey or Waroona if the proposal was approved?

On the first issue, the Forum considered the basis for existing policy and legislation (ie Australian Drinking Water Guidelines and the Country Areas Water Supply Act 1947 respectively) that prevents recreation in drinking water supply dams. The key questions arising from the experts' presentations and from reading the information provided, was “is this policy sustainable in a drying climate”; “is the policy defensible given the improvements in treatment technology?"; and “why is it other places can recreate in their drinking water sources but we cannot?".

The findings of the Forum on this matter were clear:

- The existing policy preventing recreation in public water supply dams should either be reviewed or Logues should be used as a trial/case study (allowing recreation to co-exist with irrigation and drinking water) towards such a review.

The deliberative survey conducted at the Forum supported this view, 72% of participants in the beginning and 75% at the end of the Forum recommended the policy should be reviewed. Also of note, over the course of the Forum, the proportion of participants who would very strongly support a review increased from 47% to 58%.

The Forum survey also showed that 60% in the beginning and 64% at the end of the Forum thought we could rely on treatment technologies to make our drinking water safe.
The analysis of electronic data collected from each table showed that Forum participants wanted to discuss issues that related to recreation rather than the recreation policy itself. The other more strongly supported issues were: economic and environmental considerations; water quality; treatment and monitoring; further investigations; dual use; dam flows/levels and alternative sources. This implies that participants wanted to know more, and they were not willing to simply accept or just comment on the recreation policy without more information.

On the second issue, the Forum found no comfort in the idea that any recreation potentially lost from Logues would be available (from the alternatives currently offered) elsewhere in the region. Logues is considered to be a unique location, away from any housing and the conflicts that often arise where people live near recreation sites. Few other dams allow easy access down to the waters edge and the ability to drive all the way around the dam. The people that have enjoyed the dam and its surrounds for decades would like for it to be enjoyed by future generations – away from computers, and the urban lifestyle often associated with public health problems.

Furthermore, the evidence available at the Forum from presentations and the knowledge of those present, suggested that there were only limited opportunities for any recreation replacement, relocation or enhancement to occur. Insufficient information on alternative opportunities was provided by the proponents of the proposal. The Forum was also skeptical of an approach that only offered to provide funding to address this matter after a decision to approve the trade was made. The lack of detail on this matter has plagued the assessment of this proposal since it was first raised with the community.

The findings of the Forum on this matter (in order of preference) were:

- Logues should stay as an “irrigation and recreation” dam. This would require alternative sources of water to be used to supply the required 5.3 gigalitres;
- Logues should be used for irrigation, recreation and drinking water supply, in that order, with all the existing recreation activities continuing. This may be achieved by using Logues as a dual use trial catchment, by undertaking a review to the existing policy or by an exemption for Logues; or
- The detail (determined with community and other appropriate stakeholder involvement) of alternative recreation opportunities in the Region (Waroona and Harvey) needs to be fully explored prior to any decision being made concerning the future of Logues (especially given the water at Logues is not required before June 2008) in order to obtain the facts.

These findings were supported in the deliberative survey which was conducted at the Forum.
The level of opposition to the basic proposal (ie changing the use of Logues and preventing recreation) increased over the Forum day from 77% to 87%.

The deliberative survey identified that 90% saw the loss of recreation at Logues as very bad (73%), or slightly bad (17%).

The forum was split with regards to whether an exemption to Government policy should apply at Logue Brook Dam. The Post forum results indicated that 45% thought Government should make an exception at Logue Brook Dam without changing the general policy whilst 43% thought the policy must be applied at Logue Brook Dam and if it is used for drinking water, then recreation can only be allowed if the policy is changed.

Before the Forum, half the participants felt that even if Logues became a drinking water source that there should still be unrestricted recreation allowed at the dam, with water treated and purified for consumption afterwards.

In the pre-forum survey, 67% of participants thought that the potential for increased demand on other water bodies in the area (if Logues was closed to recreation) was a bad outcome, including 42% who felt it was a very bad outcome. In the post-forum survey these two figures increased to 83% and 63% respectively.

In relation to alternative opportunities the survey found that all the opportunities considered (eg stocking of fish, walk trails, campsites, caravan park) were very important to participants, and none clearly more so than any other. The survey showed a decrease in opposition to the proposal after considering alternative opportunities. However, even with this reduced opposition, the majority of participants remained strongly opposed to the proposal.

It is also notable that the impact of alternative opportunities to reduce opposition to the proposal declined over the course of the day. In the pre-forum survey the alternative opportunities reduced opposition to a greater extent than they did in the post-forum survey.

The analysis of electronic data collected from each table also showed that the Forum again wanted to know more about the economic and environmental issues; they identified that the alternative opportunities issue was unacceptable and did not place much trust in the Water Corporation or Government. They wanted Logues to stay as it is.

Other matters that were considered by the project team have been described in this report and included under section 5 “Future Investigation”.

Findings from the Forum
The project team understands that the Forum deliberative survey findings and the findings from the random community survey are different. A potential outcome is therefore that the larger random community survey findings may be given a higher priority in the decision making process. The project team recommends against that outcome and requests that Government does not undervalue the voice of the Forum, because these are the people who have the most understanding and knowledge of the issues related to water management issues in Waroona and Harvey.
Figure 1 – South West Water Catchments
2. The Dialogue Forum

2.1 Background

In June 2005, the Department of Water (Department) received an application from Harvey Water to trade 17.1 gigalitres (GL) of water to the Water Corporation for the Integrated Water Supply Scheme (IWSS). The IWSS delivers drinking water to 1.65 million people throughout the Perth metropolitan area, the south west, and also towns and farmlands in the central wheatbelt.

It is proposed to source the 17.1 GL of water from Stirling Dam (5.8 GL), Samson Brook Dam (6 GL) and Logue Brook Dam (5.3 GL). This volume of water is expected to become available by piping the existing open channel distribution system within the Harvey Irrigation District, which will reduce evaporation and seepage losses.

The proposed water trade was referred to the Department as a licensing requirement of the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914 (RIWI Act). The function of this Act is to assess the application and either refuse or permit the trade subject to appropriate conditions and water allocation principles. The proposal also triggered the need for assessment under the Country Areas Water Supply Act 1947 (CAWS Act). Reservoirs used for public drinking water supply are gazetted under the CAWS Act so they may be protected by application of the Country Areas Water Supply By-laws 1957 and Department policy, which prohibits or restricts potentially polluting activities and land uses. Stirling Dam and Samson Brook Dam are currently used for public drinking water supply and have been gazetted under the CAWS Act. Logue Brook Dam is not a gazetted drinking water source under the CAWS Act.

A detailed explanation of the proposal and views of invited experts and key stakeholders is located on the Department of Water’s website at http://drinkingwater.water.wa.gov.au select ‘Logue Brook Dam’ under ‘Projects’.

Various public consultation methods were employed by the water trade proponents from November 2005 to February 2006, however these were limited in their scope. The community considered the process used did not engage them and failed to provide sufficient information relating to alternative recreation sites/opportunities. In response to this situation, on 17 May 2006, the Minister for Water Resources (Hon John Kobelke) announced in a media statement that comprehensive community consultation would be undertaken in a ‘catchment dialogue’ to help plan for the future use of south-west water catchments, and in particular the future use of Logue Brook Dam.
In addition to addressing community concerns, the Dialogue Forum was also expected to help the Department gather more information for incorporation into its assessment of the proposed water trade, and ultimately preparation of its advice to the Minister on this matter.

### 2.2 Introduction to the Forum

The Dialogue Forum was opened by Mr Mick Murray MLA, the Local Member for Collie-Wellington. Mr Murray welcomed all participants to the Forum and acknowledged the efforts of the Department in organising the event. Mr Murray encouraged all participants to voice their opinions and to enjoy the day.

Mr Simon Holthouse, Chairperson of the independent Logue Brook Dam Steering Committee, gave a brief overview of the Harvey Water piping proposal and highlighted the benefits which would result from this water conservation initiative. Mr Holthouse described the current management regime of Logues and explained the implications of the dam becoming a drinking water source. He advised that the Steering Committee did not have a decision making role; its purpose was to ensure that all information provided was fair, open and informative. It was reiterated that no decision on the future of Logue Brook Dam had been made, and that the final decision rests with the Minister for Water Resources.

Mr Holthouse provided three options which needed to be considered at the Forum:

1. The proposal to trade does not go ahead, Logue Brook Dam remains as “irrigation and recreation”, Water Corporation find an alternative source to supplement the Integrated Water Supply System and Harvey Water find funding elsewhere for the pipe system;
2. The proposal proceeds, recreation (particularly water based) is relocated, some low impact activities may be possible in the outer catchment but alternative trade-offs (particularly for water based activities) will have to be provided for elsewhere in the area, and this will need to include financial assistance;
3. A change in Government policy occurs allowing joint recreational uses in drinking water catchments, requiring a revised risk management approach to drinking water and additional water treatment.

Mr Holthouse recognised that there were many issues surrounding the State’s water resources and he reminded participants that the key issue for the Forum was to address the proposed water trade between Harvey Water and Water Corporation.
Dr Janette Hartz-Karp, an independent consultant of 21st Century Dialogue employed by the Department of Water, was the lead facilitator for the community engagement process employed at the Forum. Dr Hartz-Karp explained that the process was different to normal community consultation, as it provides an opportunity for participants to learn, broaden their understanding and express exactly what they are thinking. Dr Hartz-Karp introduced the support personnel and provided a brief overview of the Forum agenda. The roles of the theme team, facilitators, scribes and participants were outlined. Dr Hartz-Karp emphasised the importance of listening to others and expressing individual viewpoints.

2.3 Deliberative survey

Immediately after the introductions, Forum participants were asked to complete the first of two surveys for the day. The second survey was identical to the first but was distributed and completed at the end of the Forum after all presentations had concluded. These surveys allowed the participants’ views to be captured on general water catchment management issues (including drinking water matters) and Logue Brook Dam in particular. The two surveys enabled the Department to identify if views had shifted over the course of the day. This survey method is often described as a ‘deliberative survey’ process.

The full community based and Forum deliberative survey reports will be made available on the Department's website at http://drinkingwater.water.wa.gov.au select ‘Logue Brook Dam’ under ‘Projects’.

2.4 What issues are important to you?

Following completion of the first survey, participants were asked to write down what they considered to be the most important issues to them. This was followed by individual table discussion. All views at the twenty five tables were entered into a laptop computer. The data was transferred to a main computer and was grouped together by a ‘theme team’ to become part of a summary of key issues for Forum discussion. The full dataset entered by the tables is provided in Appendix 1. The project team sought this additional information to help them appreciate all the views put forward. They then grouped the data into like issues to form an indicative ranking based on how often an issue was raised. It should be appreciated that the approach used to determine the 'like issues' was not an exhaustive process (and was highly subjective) but it has nonetheless yielded some useful information.
2.5 Introduction to the Forum

Mr Paul Frewer, Acting Director General of the Department of Water, presented an overview on the Department’s role and responsibilities and provided an insight into the serious nature of water supply and demand management in a drying climate - with specific comment on the drying climate in the South West of WA.

Mr Frewer advised that the Department of Water was looking for advice from Forum participants on two key questions:

1. Should government policy be re-examined so that (some) recreation is allowed in and around drinking water dams?; and
2. Should the Logue Brook Dam proposal go ahead? If so, and assuming recreation is prevented from continuing, what recreation opportunities should be developed elsewhere in the Region?

Mr Frewer outlined the implications for Logue Brook Dam if it were to become a drinking water catchment and mapped out the process which would be followed prior to a decision being made.

2.6 Project team comment

The comments contained in the values and issues information (Appendix 1) on this matter are many and varied, however several common themes emerged:

Recreation:
Whilst it was acknowledged that the supply of good quality drinking water was paramount, the most popular (and probably the most forcibly articulated point) concerns the availability of recreational opportunities to the general public.

People do not want to see recreational sites diminishing. It is considered that the closure of Logues would severely limit recreational activities (especially water based activities) in the South West when there is an increasing emphasis on exercise and staying active to promote fitness and health, and an ever increasing population using these diminishing resources.

People see recreational activities, such as those offered by Logues, as a great place for family activity and for future generations to enjoy. This opinion was repeatedly articulated no doubt because of the interests of the majority of the people attending the forum. Also along the same theme is that the closure of Logues would put immense pressure on any remaining recreational sites.
Comments were split concerning whether Logues should remain open to recreation if it becomes a drinking water source. The deliberative survey indicated that the majority of people favoured a change in Government policy on this issue (72% at the beginning of the Forum and 75% at the end of the Forum).

**Water quality and quantity:**
An ongoing concern is that of drinking water quality and quantity. People have expressed the importance of maintaining an adequate supply of quality drinking water, however there appears to be a concern that the current drinking water issues (quality and quantity) are not being managed efficiently and there is no sustainable long term plan for water provision. Water conservation was a common theme. No matter what happens at Logues, piping the Harvey Irrigation District was viewed as a viable means of conserving water.

Keeping sufficient water for irrigation and water-based recreation was also an important recurring issue. There is concern about climate change and whether there will be enough water to go around in future. An issue not well explored at the Forum was the priority use of water from Logues. If less and less water is available, what use (ie irrigation, recreation or drinking water) will receive priority? Are the rights of recreation users protected by an allocation licence similar to the licences issued to irrigators? If not, how can this be made to happen?

**Financial Concerns:**
Issues concerning financial loss to the area were raised if the dam was closed for recreation use. Loss of tourism dollars to the area would have an impact. Local Shires opposed closure for this reason. It was noted several times that a dollar figure could not be placed on the value of recreation.
3. Government policy for the protection of drinking water dams

Session 1  Should government policy be re-examined so that (some) recreation is allowed in and around drinking water dams?


3.1  **CRC for Water Quality**
Speaker:  Dr Daniel Deere, CRC for Water Quality and Treatment

The key points were as follows:

- The presence of humans in and around drinking water source reservoirs can lead to contamination that can cause waterborne disease.
- Recreation is almost universally excluded in and around any direct drinking water sources for major cities fed by catchments that are largely protected and forested.
- It is the consumers/public and the water utility that will suffer any harm and cost arising from contamination of a drinking water source.
- There should be informed consent from drinking water consumers and the water utility if source waters are to be subjected to recreational activities.
- The precautionary principle should be applied to decision-making relating to the public health basics and these rights should not be compromised or put at risk.
- Perth is in the middle ground of capital cities with respect to its catchment protection approach.
- Multiple uses of catchments usually excludes human access.

Responses to questions raised from the floor include:

- The ability to scientifically differentiate/quantify the risks from the different types of recreation and other uses in a catchment, such as grazing, is difficult and not currently available. The costs for such work would also be very high.
3.2 Water Corporation
Speaker: Mr Keith Cadee, Water Corporation

The key points were as follows:

- Our customers trust is the Water Corporation’s greatest asset and we act in their interests to protect this.
- Our top priority is the safety of water we supply to protect the health of our customers.
- Our customers expect and deserve the best possible water quality and the preservation, protection and repair of catchments is imperative for this.
- Where there is a choice, use of the best source is paramount in conjunction with a policy of prevention rather than cure.
- Treatment is fallible, complex and expensive and is a last resort choice. Multi barriers (such as preventing recreation in drinking water dams) are essential in protecting the health of customers.
- The common factor in most water quality incidents around the world is that the treatment barrier failed. This is why we need catchment protection to make sure we have the best quality water available before treatment is applied.
- Logue Brook Dam needs to be considered as part of the whole solution.

Responses to questions raised from the floor include:

- The safety of water to all consumers is important whether they are in the metropolitan area or country areas. The same drinking water protection approach is used throughout WA.
- Some recreation outside an identified protection zone (2km in Perth) can occur under the current approach, it is manageable.
- User pays is a component of the current approach and an enforcement capability is provided for in by-laws.
- A broad, diverse approach to our water needs is being implemented. Both existing sources and new sources are being considered.
- Some land and water based uses are already provided for in drinking water catchments. These are managed to prevent or minimise contamination of the water.
3.3 **Recreational Fishing**

Speaker: Mr Mark Pagano, Recfishwest

A complete copy of this presentation is available from the Recfishwest website, [http://www.recfishwest.org.au](http://www.recfishwest.org.au). The key points were as follows:

- Marroning and freshwater angling are popular pastimes for generations of Western Australian’s and recreational fishing generates significant social and economic benefits to regional centres.
- The long-term future of recreational freshwater fishing across southwest WA is under threat from a number of factors including low rainfall, habitat degradation, salinisation and reduced access.
- The potential loss of access to Logue Brook Dam would significantly add to the cumulative impact of threats to the fishery.
- Managed recreational activities including fishing already co-exist in many drinking water supply dams across Australia, totalling approximately 119,000ha in NSW and Queensland alone.
- A policy of risk management rather than risk avoidance could be adopted at Logue Brook Dam, which would provide an ideal opportunity to trial restricted recreational access within drinking water catchment areas.
- Over the last 100 years we have learnt much about risks and how to deal with them. Mixed use catchment should now be viable because of this.
- We could connect Logue Brook to Stirling and take the drinking water from Stirling. This way, Logue would be a secondary source and could allow recreation to continue.

3.4 **Department of Health**

Speaker: Dr Richard Lugg, Department of Health

The key points from the presentation were as follows:

- Don’t forget WA’s own history – in the early 1890’s, 367 residents died of cholera related to human activities occurring in the catchment of Victoria dam.
- Our health depends on having an adequate supply of safe drinking water – every day.
- Disease causing microorganisms are the biggest threat to our drinking water – illness and even death can result from even one glass of contaminated water.
- The condition of the drinking water catchment is the most important factor influencing the quality of the water we drink. Our own history has shown us that natural protected catchments provide a better water quality than developed catchments.
Recreation in or near drinking water dams is not supported in order to provide safe, good quality drinking water to consumers.

- There are many beneficial uses of water but drinking water must be seen as the primary use to avoid illness, sickness and death.
- The catchment barrier is a key barrier to ensure reliably safe water for consumers. This will provide the best water quality and minimise our reliance on treatment.

Responses to questions raised from the floor include:

- The 2004 Australian Drinking Water Guidelines reflect current best practice management of drinking water sources and it recommends catchment protection together with appropriate treatment as key barriers.
- A legal obligation may attach to the way in which we protect drinking water based on the knowledge and experience now available to stakeholders from experiences worldwide. A ‘duty of care’ is expected to be applied in the provision of safe good quality drinking water now and in the future to protect the health of consumers.
- Because we do not separate water coming into a house, it must all be of a quality suitable for drinking.
- People and animals both have risks. However, people have a much higher risk compared to animals.

### 3.5 Department of Sport and Recreation

**Speaker:** Mr Graham Brimage, Department of Sport and Recreation

The key points were as follows:

- Access to the natural environment is an important cultural element of Western Australia’s lifestyle. The social, health and economic implications of the Logue Brook proposal must be properly considered.
- The need to devise new approaches to sharing finite resources is not a new phenomenon.
- The opportunity for many water based recreation opportunities in the South West of the state is becoming increasingly limited
- The Department of Sport and Recreation supports the continued use of Logue Brook dam as an irrigation and recreation water body. If Government determines that Logue Brook dam should be used for public water supply, then ‘risk management’ principles should be applied to share the resource with recreation and irrigation users.
- This is a perfect opportunity for a joint use trial in the State to allow for the monitoring and evaluation of the possible water quality impacts of recreation.
- Government must consider the future use of Logue Brook along with longer term strategies for water sourcing and efficient use within the SW of the state. Further, there is an urgent need for master planning of recreational access to waterways and dams in the SW of the state - a project necessarily to be undertaken in partnership with other resource user interests.

- If we are not careful, our recreation will only be available from a TV screen as we lose more recreation sites.

### 3.6 Project team comment

Health experts at the Forum advised that multiple use catchments around drinking water reservoirs wasn’t in the best interests of public health; however a number of points and questions were raised challenging their views.

The experts’ views appeared to be received with a degree of scepticism. It was believed that examples and statistics quoted were either out of date or irrelevant to Logues. For example, the water contamination incidents cited 1) Milwaukee - the reason(s) for this incident was not confirmed, but runoff from cow manure is a suspected source; 2) Swindon, England - this contamination was attributed to animal slurry. The examples quoted were not attributed to dual use, they were attributed to animal waste products.

In a conversation held at the Forum by a project team member with an invited expert, it was agreed that there were many sites in Australia and around the world where drinking and recreation occurred. It would also appear that if sewage can be successfully converted to drinking water (as happens in Singapore now and is proposed in Towoomba) then water from dual use reservoirs should be able to be treated to make it safe to drink.

No information was provided on the meaning of ‘dual use’. This is essential to the whole debate. If recreation was allowed and the water treated, what form of recreation would be allowed? Would it be identical to what is allowed at the moment?

Questions were also asked about the quality of existing restricted access water supplies, taking into account animal intervention, unauthorised human activity, mining and forestry activity.

A lot of the comments from the floor didn’t directly address the topic of the protection policy but questioned current water usage, wastage and conservation. The Government’s current policy may need to be reviewed to keep up with changing times, recognising that the State is experiencing a drying climate and water sources are becoming harder to find and more expensive to utilise.
As the amount of water available from Logues for drinking will only make up 2% of Perth’s total, the price of this water could go up 10 times (by using more treatment) and still not have a discernable effect on the overall cost to consumers. Real figures on the cost of treating water with or without recreation have not been made available.

It is thought the Forum participants’ mistrust of the experts’ views was reflected in the survey results which shifted an additional 4% in favour of treatment in the afternoon survey.

Findings from the Forum
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4. Do recreation opportunities exist away from Logue Brook Dam?

Session 2 - Should the Logue Brook dam proposal go ahead? If it does, and assuming recreation is prevented from continuing, what recreation opportunities do you think need to be developed at other dams in the Waroona and Harvey

4.1 Brief overview

Mr Simon Holthouse requested participants give consideration to the questions governing Session 2. He explained that whilst a decision had not yet been made on the future of Logues, it was important to ask these questions so that in the event of the proposal proceeding, it could be determined how to make it work to enable other interests to be satisfied.

4.2 Department of Environment & Conservation

Speaker: Mr Colin Ingram, Department of Environment and Conservation

The key points were as follows:

- Limited opportunities exist to replace or relocate existing recreation activities
- Where alternatives exist they are mostly of a lesser quality
- Lots of issues exist in finalising alternatives
- Costs of some alternatives may be prohibitive
- Co-existence is a cost affective viable alternative that should be strongly considered
- Co-existence should be considered on a case-by case basis
- In recent times, seven out of ten dams have had recreation uses lost from them.
- Expanding recreation at other sites may require land to be purchased.

Responses to questions raised from the floor:

- There would be significant cost associated with purchasing land to allow more recreation to occur at other dams. 1 million is a good start to better understand the options and provide for solutions, but how much more would be available from Water Corporation?
4.3  Water Corporation  
Speaker:  Mr Chris Botica, Water Corporation

The key points were as follows:

- The Water Corporation represents the broad community and is responsible for delivering a safe and economic water supply.
- The implementation of source protection at Logue Brook will impact sections of the community and place pressure on other existing facilities.
- Stakeholders will be engaged to determine the most effective way of maximising recreation at Waroona, Harvey and Drakesbrook Dams.
- The Water Corporation will immediately provide $1 million upon achievement of appropriate source protection at Logue Brook.
- Additional funding will be provided subject to the outcomes of the stakeholder recommendations.

Responses to questions raised from the floor included:

- It's a supply and demand issue. We need to get the balance right.
- Apart from the leaseholders there are no permanent residents at the caravan park, but some recognition would be needed for the investment people have made.
- Finding a replacement for the 5.3 GL of water (providing water for 30,000 people) from Logue Brook could take four or five years.

4.4  Camp Logue Brook  
Speaker:  Mr Andrew Eyre, Camp Logue Brook

The key points were as follows:

- Camp Logue Brook relies greatly on the use of the water and surrounding area of Logue Brook Dam for its Outdoor Education Program.
- Loss of this asset will force Camp Logue Brook to lay off staff. Seventy percent of who are local people and may, more than likely, see Camp Logue Brook closed down altogether due to loss of clientele and financial viability.
- Multi use dams exist in other States of Australia very successfully. We have a Sister Camp in Queensland (Camp Somerset) that operates on the edge of Lake Somerset. They have camping, water skiing, canoeing and swimming access to one of Queensland’s drinking water and catchment areas.
- WA needs to look at more than just one option (ie. no access) to its drinking water catchment areas.
- We need a specific consultation process to deal with offset opportunities on dams such as Harvey, Waroona and Drakesbrook.
- If the proposed trade goes ahead, eight recreation activities would be lost from fourteen currently available at Camp Logue Brook.
- Our kids and the next generation of our kids need ongoing access to Logue Brook Dam for recreation.
- A strategic approach for recreation opportunities is needed to guide us now and in the future.

### 4.5 Community representative

**Speaker:** Mr Kevin Keally

The key points from the presentation were as follows:

- Recreation activities in Logue Brook Dam and its catchment continues all year round for tens of thousands of people.
- The proximity of the dam to major population centres is important. This makes it a great weekend location.
- The caravan park is the point where everything revolves around.
- “There is no where to go” if we loose Logue Brook Dam. Other places are already overcrowded.
- Logue Brook Dam must be available for continued recreation even if its also used as a public drinking water supply.
- Up to 60,000 people enjoy Logue Brook Dam the way it is.
- We need to free the catchments up and get better inflow rates.
- More water restrictions should be considered to save water.
- The Harvey Water trade project is not dependent on the Logue Brook Dam proposal being approved. The National Water Initiative should be considered a priority for funding.
- Outdoor recreation pursuits are very important to regional communities because they do not have access to the same opportunities that exist in larger population centres.
- The community needs certainty about other opportunities before any decision is made, not just a promise to look into it.

### 4.6 Forum Conclusion

Mr Paul Frewer and Mr Simon Holthouse thanked all participants for their attendance, acknowledging that the day was a success and a step forward in community consultation. Mr Mick Murray closed the Forum.
4.7 **Project team comment**

The majority of views from the floor on this topic again followed those in the previous two topics. Leave Logues as it is, examine ways of using existing supplies more efficiently and examine alternative sources of potable water.

The comments from the floor that directly addressed this issue were almost 100% in agreement that no alternative recreational sites currently exist in the area. The presentations addressing offsets did little to alleviate this concern. The opportunities which exist at other nearby dams, ie Drakesbrook, Harvey and Waroona, are extremely limited.

Drakesbrook is a tiny body of water and considered completely unsuitable for any form of power boating, in addition it is situated in such a position that makes any form of bush walking, trail bike riding etc impossible. The water in Harvey Dam is of a poor quality and is situated in a semi populated area which makes many of the activities carried out at Logues, including Camp Logue Brook, impossible. The only viable option, Waroona, is already overcrowded. Spending any amount of money at this site will not alleviate this problem. If Logues did close it may only be a matter of time before there was a serious injury or death resulting from a boating accident on Waroona.

There is no alternative to the facilities and recreational opportunities presented by Logues. It seems that the Water Corporation undertook little research before making the monetary relocation offer. The lack of real information on alternative recreation sites (despite this matter being a key limitation of the previous community consultation work) was surprising and disappointing.

The project team is concerned that the results of the survey on this topic could be misinterpreted. The vast majority indicated that it would be essential that other recreational sites be established; however this was under the assumption that Logues was closed. There was no consideration of the fact that there are no viable alternate options. It would seem that this became more obvious as the day progressed as in the final survey the number of people supporting the changes to Logues with trade offs decreased.
5. Further investigation

During the course of writing this report and looking at the data, the project team noted some specific issues that either warrant further investigation or are important messages for Government. They are:

- Why not consider the option of using Logue Brook Dam as a ‘secondary source’ only reservoir? This should allow recreation to continue at Logues because water would be pumped to another existing drinking water dam (eg Samson, Stirling or South Dandalup) which is not open for recreation before being treated and used in the IWSS;
- What is the priority use of water in Logues or other local dams such as Waroona? If less and less water is available, which use: irrigation; recreation; or drinking water, will receive priority? Will the rights of recreation users be protected by an allocation licence similar to the licence granted to irrigators? If not, why not and how will the rights of recreation users be protected?;
- Alternative water supply sources need to be fully investigated;
- Many questions and issues remain unclear or unanswered, including some responses from the panel (see appendix 1); and
- More research and advice on recreation risks to drinking water quality is needed.
6. Conclusion

In order to assess the viability of the proposed water trade between Harvey Water and Water Corporation and the subsequent proposed use of Logue Brook Dam as a drinking water source, the Department of Water and ultimately Government needs to consider both local and broad ranging community views.

There is no doubt water catchment management issues currently being dealt with by Government can take some of the findings from the Forum to help determine where action, such as information and education, is required. The limited understanding by most people on the existing work being undertaken to address water supply and demand issues is an area that needs to be dealt with urgently. The opportunities for water conservation must be encouraged and the pros, cons, economics and environmental effects of various water source options available to the State need to be investigated and explained.

An important message from the Forum was that the recreation value of water cannot be underestimated. In the country especially, where other recreation opportunities are limited compared to metropolitan areas, this value is highly rated. The tourism value of Logue Brook Dam was also considered to be high.

The majority of Forum participants clearly wanted Logues to be left as it is, or used for a dual use trial or for the existing Government policy (preventing recreation in and around drinking water dams) to be reviewed to enable full recreation to continue at Logues.

On the issue of alternative recreation opportunities, if Logue Brook Dam were to be closed to recreation, the majority view was that there was currently no simple alternative recreation site(s) in Harvey or Waroona. Not only is Logues considered unique because it is located away from people and their homes, but other potential dams were already considered overcrowded; of a poor water quality or lower tourism/recreational value than Logues.

It was considered that insufficient work had been undertaken at this time to address this issue of offsets properly. Water Corporation’s offer of $1 million or so was also considered inadequate, especially given that funding was not available until after Logues was committed to as a drinking water source. This was viewed by the project team as putting the ‘cart before the horse’. In addition, several participants felt that Water Corporation would or could not follow through with their commitments.
The project team understands that the Forum deliberative survey findings and the findings from the random community survey are different. A potential outcome is therefore that the larger random community survey findings may be given a higher priority in the decision making process. The project team recommends against that outcome and requests that Government does not undervalue the voice of the Forum, because these are the people who have the most understanding and knowledge of the issues related to water management issues in Waroona and Harvey.

The project team would like to thank all Forum participants for taking the time to become involved in this important issue for the south-west. Every effort has been made in this report to fairly represent the many views which were voiced at the Forum.
Appendix 1

Logue Brook Dam - South West Catchment Management
Community Dialogue Forum, Harvey

Participants’ comments from each table

Nearly 200 people participated in the Community Dialogue Forum held in Harvey on 22nd July 2006. The Forum included self nominated community members from a large random sample of metropolitan and south west residents, respondents to advertisements and invited stakeholders.

The venue was set up with 25 tables, each with a networked laptop, a facilitator and seating for nine people. A volunteer at each table carried out the role of the scribe. The scribe was responsible for inputting individual and group viewpoints into the laptop. These messages were then electronically sent to a mainframe computer, where a theme team analysed the comments, grouped them into key themes and projected them back into the room for all participants to see. A panel made up of experts invited to give presentations at the Forum responded to these questions and others from the floor.

Due to timing constraints, not all comments entered into laptops could be addressed at the Forum. However, to ensure transparency of the process, this raw data is provided in the following sections below:

1) Values and issues identified by each participant
   A worksheet was distributed to all participants at the beginning of the Forum. Each person noted down what was most important to them and this was fed directly into the laptop.

2) Session 1 – Should government policy be re-examined so that (some) recreation is allowed in and around drinking water catchments?
   Table responses to the question and presentations.

3) Session 2 – Should the Logue Brook Dam proposal go ahead? If it does, and assuming recreation is prevented from continuing, what recreation opportunities do you think need to be developed at other dams in the Waroona and Harvey areas?
   Table responses to the question and presentations.
SUMMARY

In order of the most number of comments first

Worksheet 1 – Our Values: What is most important to you about this issue?

- No change to status quo, leave as “recreation and irrigation” (46)
- Other, economics, environmental considerations, etc (35)
- Local business / local growth / local users / tourism (23)
- Importance of recreation – health, family, ‘get 30’ (21)
- Keep government policy as is (15)
- Seek alternative sources (13)
- Offsets / alternative recreation sites (12)
- Dual use (11)
- Re-examine government policy re: drinking water catchments & recreation (9)
- Reach compromise (8)
- Water conservation (7)
- Water trade / piping occurs (5)
- User pays (2)

Session 1 – Should Government policy be re-examined so that (some) recreation is allowed in and around drinking water dams?

- Other, ie. economics, environmental considerations, etc (47)
- Water quality / treatment / monitoring (27)
- Water conservation / education (18)
- Further investigations required / postpone decision (15)
- Dual use (15)
- Seek alternative sources (15)
- Dam inflows / levels / availability (15)
- Economics / costings (11)
- Re-examine government policy re: drinking water catchments & recreation (10)
- Effects of animals, faeces and carcasses (8)
- Keep government policy as is (6)
- Importance of recreation – health, family, ‘get 30’ (5)
- Local business / local growth / local users / tourism (4)
- Contamination events / examples – relevance to LBD? (4)
- No change to status quo, leave as “recreation and irrigation” (2)
- Offsets / alternative recreation sites (2)
- Water trade / piping occurs (2)
- User pays (2)
- Reach compromise (1)
Session 2 – Should the Logue Brook Dam proposal go ahead? If it does, and assuming recreation is prevented from continuing, what recreation opportunities do you think need to be developed at other dams in the Waroona and Harvey area?

- Economics (incl. reference to $1m) (26)
- Other, ie. environmental considerations, etc (21)
- Offsets unacceptable (19)
- Trust issues in relation to Govt or Water Corporation (17)
- No change to status quo, leave as “recreation and irrigation” (13)
- Seek alternative sources (9)
- Further investigations required / postpone decision (7)
- Water conservation / education (7)
- Importance of recreation – health, family, ‘get 30’ (7)
- Re-examine government policy re: drinking water catchments & recreation (4)
- Local business / local growth / local users / tourism (4)
- Water quality / treatment / monitoring (4)
- Dual use (4)
- Dam inflows / levels / availability (4)
- Keep government policy as is (3)
- Water trade / piping occurs (3)
- User pays (1)
- Reach compromise (1)

Notes:

1. Where one statement could clearly fit into two of the above categories it was replicated and placed in both sections

2. Comments have been categorised according to the wording used, rather than assumptions made on the underlying view/position behind the statement.
**Worksheet 1 - Our Values: What is most important to you about this issue?**

**Participants’ comments from each table**

1. Interest in fishing, marroning in dams, would pay to use the dam for fishing.
2. Active recreational use of water resources.
3. $9 national park fee to pay for management of water catchment, annual pass, user pays, shire rates.
5. Recent arrivals to area, recreation, local environment.
6. To maintain recreational options in the SW area. Look at other options to solve problems of increasing population in neighbourhood.
7. Sufficient water in the southwest to allow my children to enjoy water based recreation, and encourage growth in agriculture, horticulture, fish farming.
8. Water recycling proposal, managed aquifer recharge 120 gigalitres goes out to sea.
9. Compromises necessary to ensure Perth gets water to put on their gardens.
10. Stirling Dam and past history of recreational and industrial use within the catchment, timber mill town, no compromise to water quality.
11. I have been a semi-permanent resident at Logue Brook dam for 16 years, enjoying water sport, bike riding and just being in the bush away from the norm. I will be devastated to lose the place, my 10 year old daughter has grown up there, what a wonderful way to bring up kids.
12. Multi-use of our water, not reducing access to one area and putting increased pressure on others.
13. After reading some of the information about Logue Brook Dam that water is sold but the firm buying the water does the treatment.
14. For Logue Brook to remain exactly as it is - recreation and irrigation.
15. I am a farmer of 50 years and believe the water should be used for food for WA.
16. To have a valid say in the future of Logue Brook water. A blend of recreation and irrigation purposes I believe to be the best outcome.
17. There is a need to cultivate a balanced usage plan for all waterbodies to enable all to use the resource.
18. Need to keep some recreational areas open.
19. Environmental ethics in the age of self. We may be able to sell resources but this sale is not justified as yet because drinking water is being wasted and more can be done to save it.
20. Government policy should be re-examined regarding drinking water and fishing etc. We need to keep available ability for all activities, water, fishing, camping water-skiing, etc.
21. Water supply needs of WA and protection of public water.
22) To help achieve an outcome either way so we can move on and to encourage best irrigation practice into the future.
23) Ensuring that water quality is appropriate for drinking and inexpensive.
24) Preservation of Logue Brook as is. Development?
25) Completion of HW Pipe Scheme ensuring enough water is held in the dam for irrigation and recreation.
26) Best usage, multi purpose. Better catchment in metro area.
27) Keep Logue Brook as is. People need somewhere to go for recreation.
28) Keep Logue Brook as is. For the future as the past has been.
29) Walking group would like activities continued. Don't refuse access.
30) Future water supplies needed for rural, recreation, domestic. Without it no future.
32) Representing LB Ski Club concerned about losing designated club training at Logue Brook dam.
33) Concerned about possible loss of water entitlement for agricultural use for scheme water.
34) Better use of limited water supplies encompassing continued recreational use. Dialogue between Government and the community to achieve a fair result for all.
35) While water is important so are recreational activities and the loss of recreation area is not a good thing. Recreation, camping, family life etc. is something we all need.
36) As an irrigation dairy farmer, I’m here as a stakeholder and can appreciate the reasons for piping the water and also the need for extra water for Perth. However I can also appreciate the recreational arguments and would like to see an outcome that suits most of us and addresses the State’s requirements.
37) Irrigation water supply.
38) Families that play together stay together.
39) Lowering water levels in all dams if used for irrigation and drinking water.
40) No guarantee that alternative areas for recreation will be maintained in the future.
41) To maintain Logue Brook dam as a recreational facility and remain unchanged.
42) Not closing the dam for skiing, bike riding, and horses.
43) Where are my kids going to ski and the family and Harvey Town, etc?
44) Financial impact on the caravan park and its semi-permanent residents.
45) Financial impact on businesses in Harvey.
46) To ensure all options considered.
47) To ensure our drinking water is safe and free from contamination.
48) Ability for recreational access at Logue Brook dam to be maintained. Concerns that if joint use is permitted the lack of water will not facilitate
recreational use. Believe the Harvey water piping proposal should go ahead and be funded regardless.

49) Maintaining recreational opportunities.
50) Use water already available more efficiently, e.g. recycling.
51) Certainty about future recreational uses.
52) Capacity for water trading to occur.
53) Re-vitalise Logue Brook to what it used to be. Essential recreational and tourist show place for locals and tourists. Brings money and business into Cookernup and Shire.
54) Want piped water to farm. Not enough water in dams and less rain in area for residents.
55) The loss of freedom to recreate in our country district and the lack of government clarity in decision making with regard to water policy.
56) The ability of government in not making enough resources available to supply enough new water for expansion issues. The fear that once the Water Department get a dam they will try for more.
57) Preventing the unnecessary elimination of quality recreation opportunities when other solutions to drinking water provision are available.
58) Maintain the current recreational skiing and camping facilities in and around Logue Brook dam.
59) I’m here to voice my concerns that we do not lose a recreational body of water in a world of diminishing recreational opportunities.
60) Lost use of catchment for recreation.
61) Keeping the catchment area open.
62) Maintain Logue Brook as a recreational facility not only for skiing/water sports but also to maintain family values and traditions by getting them away from TV, video games and the Internet.
63) In general recreation is vitally important to the community as a whole.
64) We would like to find alternative solutions to Perth’s water situation other than what seems to be an easy fix/grab.
65) The closure will have a greater impact on responsible users as opposed to those who currently use it irresponsibly and who could rotationally continue to do so.
66) The concern is that if Logue Brook is lost to recreation how long will it be until other recreational facilities are closed?
67) If Logue Brook is closed what will the impact be on other recreational facilities, i.e. overloading because of limited recreational facilities available.
68) That the use of Logue Brook dam can be maintained for recreational purposes.
69) The use of the waterbodies and surrounding areas for recreation, farming, and drinking? What's the value of water?
70) That the final result is a benefit i.e. win/win situation to all parties involved.
71) Maintenance of recreation and rural lifestyle plus tourism needs.
72) Recreational use needs to be maintained for the benefits of pleasure/tourism etc. But drinking water supply is also essential.
73) That the current recreational facilities are retained at Logue Brook dam.
74) The ability to freely recreate with my family and friends.
75) The ability to be involved in the sport of water skiing in a safe and friendly environment.
76) Loss of sporting and recreational opportunity on and around Logue Brook dam.
77) Retaining water for recreation for all to use.
78) Retaining water for recreation for all to use.
79) Historical use of dams to remain.
80) Target good water!
81) To give the public access to the forest and to the bush.
82) To educate the public on how to behave in the bush!
83) Desalination.
84) Recreation interests are always taken into consideration along with other users of the resource - i.e. Water Corp, farming interests etc.
85) I believe all interests can be addressed in a co-operative way for sharing the resource.
86) Loss of water in catchment (i.e. road stormwater) and recycled water, Water Corp too much profit.
87) Mr Frewer - What about the mild seasons’ impact on water?
88) I don’t believe water from this area should leave the region, it’s important for future food production for the masses. If Logue Brook is used for drinking water it should also remain for recreation.
89) Government attitude toward "risk management" rather than the easier 'risk prevention' - it is easier to ban activities rather than to spend money on purification, i.e. drinking and recreation should coexist.
90) Fishing is historically a traditional activity and should be continued.
91) Huge state government campaign “finds 30”, yet government is closing recreational facilities at the same time - not an option.
92) Extra cost in filtering and processing water as expensive as it may be would be pittance compared to cost of treating health issues relating to unhealthy lifestyles. Landowner wanting to achieve healthy lifestyles on a farm stay for Perth kids, fighting obesity etc. Therefore dual use with risk management.
93) Retain Logue Brook dam for recreation as per the status quo. The cost saved in implementing inclusion of Logue Brook in trade scheme (1 - 3 million) is insignificant when taking into account the benefits of recreation and healthy activities. Explore alternative water sources instead.
94) Dam used for drinking water should also be used for limited recreation, i.e. no direct body contact.
95) Learning other’s opinions today, don’t know a lot about the issues but keep all drinking water separate from irrigation water.
96) To safeguard recreational uses in a state with growing population. Sustainability is important for recreation as well as water supply uses. Need integrated water use plan not like current approach where planning water supply takes place in isolation from recreational uses. There is a need for a cost/benefit analysis of the current proposal.
97) Likes clean drinking water but also likes camping at Logue Brook since the mid 1980s. Sons grew up around Logue Brook and learned how to ski, marron and trout fishing. Their love of the bush and the environment developed from their time around Logue Brook. Therefore shouldn’t stop recreation. Fence sitting!

98) Maintain status quo.

99) Clean, safe drinking water is available.

100) Protect drinking water from potential pollution.

101) Ord River water piped to Perth.

102) No loss of tourist facilities and income from tourism.

103) As a family we don’t want Logue Brook dam to become part of a water catchment area.

104) To maintain present recreational activities.

105) To maintain recreational facilities and irrigation water supplies.

106) That Logue Brook Dam remains open to all recreation.


108) Continued access for recreational fisheries to dams and rivers in catchment areas which have been declining in recent years.

109) That the community be able to continue to access a community owned resource.

110) Recreational access to all dams, including Logue Brook - change policy.

111) Loss of recreational use - affected by multiple of users. Other options to be found to increase water and better use of available water.

112) Worried about loss of recreation in the Harvey area, effect on local economy, loss of tourist dollars and reduced visitor numbers to Harvey. Remain as recreational and irrigation dam.

113) Want to keep it as an irrigation/recreation dam. Very important healthy lifestyles, especially with our children. We need to keep them away from the computer screens. The social and health benefits of outdoor recreation should not be compromised for more green grass in Perth. Keep the water from the South West in the south west.

114) Local area should be serviced - other sources sourced for Perth - better education for saving water.

115) Need adequate and continuous clean water supply for everyone.

116) Preservation of recreational activities.


118) Preserving space around water areas.

119) Restrictions to activities in hills areas.

120) Loss of active recreation areas.

121) Restriction of people into selected pockets.

122) Other options exist than this.

123) Need to recreate is more important.

124) Loss of active recreation areas.

125) Thin edge of the wedge - what will be next?

126) Loss of ability to enjoy aesthetic qualities of the dam area.

127) Need to research and develop alternate sources of water.
128) Need for the long term view to be considered.
129) Long term water sustainability for the whole State.
130) The safe supply of public drinking water. Therefore if Logue Brook Dam is considered for drinking water supply, the catchment is protected and there will be no recreation within the catchment area.
131) Myself and family have a caravan at Logue Brook and would like the water to come from somewhere else so we can stay.
132) Ensure the availability of recreational water sports areas for the use by the public (e.g. dams, lake, river, etc).
133) Don't want to lose the ability to use this area around the dam. Recreation for me has a personal significance.
134) The future management in view of climate change and forecasting outcomes possible.
135) A real concern about the changing weather patterns and the decreasing topic of water = affecting lifestyle.
136) Closing off areas which will limit further areas available to 4 x 4 wheel driving recreation.
137) A setting of policy directions for future water use in W.A. as water demands and population grow, especially with climate change.
138) Harvey Water for stock and agriculture. Sport and recreation is a bonus.
139) Good management of a scarce resource. Provision of safe drinking water. Accommodating as many needs as possible. i.e. best compromise.
140) To stand in the way of government entities acting in their own best financial interests.
141) To ensure quality fishing opportunities in a fast growing community.
142) To see this entire debacle as representative of poor government forward planning.
143) To seek a compromise solution which provides some recreational use without endangering the safety of the drinking supply.
144) To keep Logue Brook Dam as it is for recreation and irrigation.
145) There are good methods for treating water that is also used for recreation.
146) Stakeholder/Residents stand to lose homes which is really not an option.
147) Having a better understanding of how recreational activities can coexist with water catchment.
148) Need access to bush areas.
149) Protect drinking water.
150) Protect environment.
151) Recreational facilities within catchment areas.
152) Interested in protecting water availability for agricultural production.
153) The contamination of the provision of safe drinking water to the community.
154) Provision of adequate supply of safe drinking water.
155) Water being pure and available in this dry climate.
156) Enough water.
157) Recreational access whilst considering environmental issues and recognising need for added water supplies.
158) If we lose Logue Brook, will it start a domino effect on the rest of the dams?
159) I am a farmer very interested in the pipeline for exchange of water; a direction for Harvey Water.
160) Irrigation and recreation should remain at Logue Brook. The government should investigate wide-ranging alternative water supplies for all WA.
161) That awareness is gained about the importance of non-wastage of our most precious resource.
162) What is the 5-10 year plan for water supply?
163) Long term effect on the environment.
164) The effect on businesses operating in the area – tourism.
165) Preserve water for local users.
166) Look at alternative water supply for metro area.
167) That the Department of Water become responsible.
168) Their obligations on their commitment to the Harvey Dam make many of the questions in today's Forum unanswerable.
169) The recreational use of the dam as it is a water source and we are fast running out of places/water that we are able to use for recreation. As a wakeboard member it is difficult to find water.
170) Wake boarding (skiing) camping. Close place for a break from work.
171) To maintain the recreational use of our natural and artificial water storage bodies.
172) Retaining recreational usage while maximising the availability of safe drinking water.
174) That the lifestyles of those outside the metro area are respected and maintained - that the SW area not be totally changed in the interests of the populated areas. - That the 'simple life' be well supported in these days of sophistication and 'catered for entertainment'. - That 'money' doesn't dictate all government policy.
175) That precious, high quality water resources are properly protected so that they can be safely used for human consumption.
176) That the trade occurs so that Harvey Water can fund the piping and save the water that is currently lost.
177) Ensuring that catchment areas remain open for recreation. Failing this, that provisions be made to ensure bush walking activities can still be conducted within catchment areas.
178) Due to increasing population in this region, the need to ensure there are adequate recreation facilities remaining in the area is paramount.
179) City people are still wasting water and they don't have a full understanding of where water comes from which is mainly from rural areas.
180) There is an on-going loss of free recreational activities in natural areas.
181) There is a major need to review and change existing government policy on human activities in water supply dam catchments by accepting greater risk as a result of reduced restrictions on some human activities.

Findings from the Forum
182) That the State Government completely reviews its policies and attitudes towards resources, especially as they relate to country people.

183) The whole issue of water is too narrow. No regard is given to future increased population and the need for extra water to supply that demand when south west water is exhausted.

184) No answer - no comment on these issues.

185) The feelings of country people don’t count. Take our water and recreation areas - shut down train service - then send us their toxic waste.

186) That catchment management policies change to recognise the real risks presented by different types of recreation, and the water treated appropriately.

187) Correct management of a shared resource.

188) Drinking water issue is important. Yet - recreational uses should not be forgotten.

189) That recreational activities already enjoyed at Logue Brook Dam be maintained as they are. This includes the surrounding bushland.

190) That Logue Brook Dam should be retained for irrigation and recreation purposes only.
**Session 1 – Should Government policy be re-examined so that (some) recreation is allowed in and around drinking water dams?**

**Participants’ comments from each table**

1) Inflows to dams, are there any guarantees that dams will fill?
2) The amount of water from runoff is declining, water quality in Peel-Harvey estuary declining, largely blaming agriculture.
3) The policy preventing recreation in drinking water dams should be reviewed for sure, levies?
4) What are the increased costs for relying on treatment? Keep Logue Brook Dam for recreation and expand recreation on Logue Brook Dam, keep it as a node.
5) Current water quality in Logue Brook Dam is very high. It has had recreational access since 1964, with no impact on water quality. South West towns have had dual access to water from their dams and its had no affect on personal health since that date. Why have we had historical dual access for water but you are now saying we should not?
6) We need to generate revenue to fund management of common resources, recreation.
7) Water Corporation said: preserve, protect, repair the catchment not only for water resource but also for water dependant ecosystems, streams, riparian zones, forests.
8) The only presentation to use the word ‘efficiency’ was by Fisheries, with regard to Harvey Water irrigators.
9) There is a lot of effort happening to "save" 17 gigalitres (5.3 from Logue), what is the guarantee that what is "saved" is going to be "spent" efficiently?
10) Can the Department of Water guarantee water security? Quality and Quantity.
11) This 5.3 gig of water is to go to Perth and end up on gardens (50%). More control of domestic use of water in Perth is needed.
12) This is a Perth issue, and the solution is being shifted to users in the south west.
13) Human faeces impacts on water supply, what is the impact from animal faeces on water quality, also wildcat camping?
14) DEC 1080 baiting, dead feral animals, compromise water quality.
15) Are Perth people expecting too much? Water quality, acceptable risk to water quality.
16) What about volunteer rangers to police access to dam edges?
17) What are the stream inflows for 2006? The graph presented only went up to 2005.
18) Historical use of environmental flows from Stirling Dam down the stream from the dam.
19) Concern that animals defecate and die in water, humans are not the only health risk. Use the multi barrier systems to kill bacteria.
20) Quality of water being used for recreation, compared to dams without boats on should be tested, and if a test has been done, results should be made public.

21) Concerns of water contamination if recreation continues.

22) Dams in Queensland are used for recreation and drinking with no detrimental effects.

23) The presentations have been skewed towards a predetermined outcome supported by Health Department and Water Corp.

24) What is the outcome if the is dam closed, where will recreation take place? Overcrowding will mean other dams will be unsafe.

25) Why not take the 5.3 GL of water from Stirling or Harvey, or both and leave Logue Brook alone.

26) Trials should be conducted to prove or disprove whether recreation and drinking are compatible.

27) What about Tourism? its being neglected, and it provides funding to this State. Better education enables residents and community members to know the best way to conserve water.

28) Is 5.3 GL really significant for Perth supply compared to the happiness of in excess of 30,000 people who visit the dam and the wineries?

29) The importance of agriculture in conjunction with recreation and tourism.

30) The catchment of Logue Brook is not now a pristine environment. If it is made a potable water catchment how long will it take for the catchment to become an A1 area? If human activity is excluded now, how long before the Health Department would be prepared to use the water as drinking water?

31) Recreational use of the fresh water dams and catchments is not the only degrading factor. All fresh waterbodies are impacted by industry, farming practices and many other factors. It appears that excluding recreational activities is an easy option. What are the thoughts of the panel on excluding, industry effluent, fertiliser, etc?

32) Given the fact that water in London is used many times over using treatment what is the problem with changing the policy in WA to provide multiple use of our catchments with a treatment regime?

33) It would be better to use treated wastewater for non-drinking uses in the State rather than pumping it into the ocean. This would possibly negate the need for these mooted closures of recreational waterbodies.

34) Need better government strategy on water wastage as given the projected population growth even current controls will not be sustainable.

35) Water based recreational facilities are limited for regional areas and further closures will only make it worse for regional people.

36) A large amount of fresh water supplied is used for industry and is a wasted resource as treated wastewater could easily be used.

37) Desalination of dumped water from dams such as Wellington Dam using reverse osmosis would be a better option.

38) Why are impacts of animals (both feral & native, eg. Pigs) not considered as a threat but humans are?
39) If there was to be a trial of dual use, who will get access to the dam at the end of the day if trial concludes dual use is not appropriate?
40) Is the Water Corporation taking the easy option by excluding recreation from catchment areas?
41) The view is NO to re-examine policy
42) Why is dual use at Logue Brook being considered, but not elsewhere?
43) Sharing is fine, but only if better filtration and processes are applied to improve supply to pristine quality, but I don’t have complete faith it.
44) Suggest the 5.3GL is set for a period of time subject to change as the capacity of Logue is about 9 GL, so is there enough water to warrant a policy review/change?
45) The policy preventing recreation in dams needs to be reviewed as a matter of course.
46) Is the water in Logue potable now? Has it been tested recently?
47) Will a policy review address the concern that a diminished resource is being considered for increased access and the impact on the local community?
48) Is there any evidence of contamination in the areas where combined uses currently occur?
49) Will use of catchment areas increase/decrease opportunity for sabotage?
50) Will Alcoa’s proposed expansion impact water levels and quality in area?
51) How would management be enforced if exclusion is not the preferred option (eg. fishing with bait/lure or motor boats).
52) Concerned that dams are being utilised for potable water when most of their water goes on plants, toilets, washing cars etc. Potable water should only go to sinks and showers.
53) A concern is that if it is dual use, will levels in the dam, after water is taken for potable use, allow recreational uses to continue?
54) If dual use occurs what current activities will be allowed to continue? It’s not clear.
55) Is joint use going to be a viable option?
56) Given the amount of water to be taken, does this make recreation activity unviable even if joint use is allowed?
57) What are natural causes of contamination in the catchment area and impact on water quality, eg. wild pigs?
58) What are we doing currently in terms of treating our water? Don’t we intervene with chemicals now to treat our water for drinking?
59) Are there any sources of human contamination disease which can’t be removed from current treatment?
60) If the dual use trial went ahead, how long would it need to happen to assess impacts on quality of water?
61) At Logue Brook, what is the current quality of the water? Have current levels of recreation affected the quality?
62) Does anyone use Logue water for drinking now?
63) What were the sources of contamination in other western society’s outbreaks of drinking water? What were their protection strategies?
64) Would passive recreation such as swimming, fishing, sailing and picnicking cause any greater health risk or increased treatment costs than those current. Refer to the Brisbane river water supply process.

65) With climatically less water available the water should stay in the region so as not to restrict the growth of the local areas.

66) On the heath issue, I believe the risk is extremely low on getting a waterborne disease. So combined uses should be allowed with downstream treatment. Even if the water costs more.

67) With Brisbane drawing water from the river and Sydney having a 3km exclusion zone, how do the two water supplies compare for quality and previous disease problems?

68) What is the long term plan for NWI promoted direct trade with individual irrigators being considered by DoW?

69) Why can't there be a compromise on the usage of the dam?

70) What is the DoW's authority over the regulation and the assigning of responsibility to the various water authorities ie Water loses in the current distribution system?

71) What is the DoW doing in regards to reviewing the current policy?

72) Have investigations been made into more efficient uses of our current water supplies as opposed to simply increasing water catchment areas to cater for an increasing population ie grey water?

73) What can be done to improve the water catchment areas in terms of ensuring more run off into the dams?

74) Are there any other avenues being investigated to supply water to Perth and what are they?

75) How is unprotected water currently being treated in other areas ie the SA Murray and Brisbane rivers, Perth’s ground water and the desal plant?

76) Will the non-closure of Logue in effect cause the non payment of a 70 million dollar grant allocated to Harvey Water?

77) With the current rainfall trends, is the reliance on water catchment areas a viable solution for the future supply of water?

78) Why is Water Corp not addressing the issues of water wastage due to failing infrastructure and why do they not have more stringent regulations placed on them?

79) In the documented cases, what caused the failure of the water treatment facility and do these cases have any relevance to the proposal for Logue?

80) Are we being over cautious of our water quality?

81) Can they guarantee the quality of the water from Logue be maintained when it enters the Perth water supply?

82) Why can't a trial of water quality be conducted with Logue Brook when using it for recreation and drinking water (dual use)?

83) Do you think an Environmental Course and Licence would assist with access to water dams and assist in the care of the dam?

84) Does only 5 gig of water actually affect the total water supplied to drinking water supplies?

85) Can we currently, with technology, remove hydrocarbons and water based diseases?
86) What is Water Corps plan "B" if Logue Brook is taken off the table as a drinking water supply?

87) What is the difference between pure water and treated water?

88) Can recreational uses eg: water sports actually help water quality by increasing the water movement?

89) Overall the team is of the opinion that the Department of Water has responded favourably to community concerns.

90) Will there be a paper distributed to the public for further comment following this forum?

91) If recreational activity has not affected the potable water quality in the last 20 years - What will be different now and into the future?

92) Why is mining and logging permitted within the close confines of the catchment area for "Logue Brook Dam"? If the catchment is to remain pristine would that mean ceasing development, deforestation & all activities?

93) The Water Corporation did not honour all of the promises it made with respect to the Harvey Dam; How do we know they will honour promises they make about "Logue Brook"?

94) Is the run off into dams like Logue Brook affected by the lack of "cold burn"?

95) Why does Western Australia have to have an exclusion policy, when it is satisfactory for Brisbane to draw its drinking water from a river which is used for commercial & recreational activities?

96) The group supports the Department of Sport and Recreation’s view in relation to multiple outcomes and the possibility of Logue Brook Dam becoming a test case and used for all forms of recreation?

97) Why doesn't the Water Corporation further treat the wastewater that is pumped to sea every day - 320 million litres

98) Why is recreation currently excluded from drinking water catchments but mining, logging, exploration etc. are allowed?

99) How is it proposed to control and exclude animal excrement and contamination from waterbodies?

100) What would be the economic cost of excluding Logue Brook Dam from the Harvey proposal? (The paperwork states $50m - where does this amount come from?)

101) What would be the economic cost of excluding Logue Brook Dam from the Harvey proposal? (The paperwork states a saving of $1 - 3m - where does this amount come from?)

102) Who are the beneficiaries of the water trade financially? Are the irrigators bearing the cost or are the ordinary tax-payers paying for it?

103) The idea as promoted in the Sport and Recreation speech about creating a masterplan for recreation access to water and water catchments is a great idea, but it needs to be complete before we look at individual cases like Logue Brook. Therefore the decision for Logue Brook should be delayed until a masterplan for the State is completed.
104) The current government policy on recreation in drinking water catchments should be reviewed, until it is, the current status quo for Logue should be maintained.

105) Health and wellbeing is a big issue for society, we need space to recreate to ensure a healthy lifestyle. It is completely lost in this Logue Brook issue. We need to explore all other options that won't impact on health and wellbeing and people's opportunity to recreate.

106) Why won't monitoring pick up any potential contaminants before it goes to consumers? (as stated in the Health Department paperwork). Is there any reason why we can't have automatic monitoring systems enacted?

107) If we're not using Logue Brook, what other sources would we be using - ie. look elsewhere for sources.

108) Future reduction in rainfall (5% to 20% forecast by CSIRO) means no water should be taken from Logue at all.

109) Future recreational demands may lead to higher contaminants and future health issues caused by treatment options.

110) Should the Department of Sport and Recreation promote activities other than water sport recreation activities?

111) Does Rec Fishing accept that fisher people should pay for water treatment?

112) Very low impact recreational activities may be tolerable & therefore Government policies should be re-examined.

113) Savings shown by using LBD water (50M over 10 years) will be far outweighed by the cost of relocation of facilities and buying catchment land.

114) Irrigation and recreation are compatible at Logue but not the case with recreation and drinking water.

115) Concern that the demands for water from Logue and other dams in the area would increase in the future and compromise the future of irrigation in the region.

116) This proposal is only a temporary measure and a longer term view is required.

117) Minority view - Gov policy to remain as is.

118) If there was multi use, how restrictive would it be for recreation?

119) Why would we still be looking at catchments in the southwest when more rainfall is available in the northwest?

120) Recreation doesn't degrade water quality more than natural processes - eg animals dying, weeing etc. We need evidence of this.

121) How does the level of risk associated with treating water from Cockburn Sound for use in a de-salination plant differ from level of risk associated with treating from catchment areas?

122) How much so called drinking water is consumed by humans as opposed to gardens and industry?

123) Minority view - Would prefer that recreation is suspended rather than rely on additional chemical water treatment - leave policy as is.
124) Support policy being re-examined in light of today’s changing attitudes and technology. We can desalinate water, why can’t we treat water used for recreation?
125) Water Corp - have they looked at other alternatives to get that 5 GL from Logue ie moving farmers away from flood irrigation to centre pivot irrigation, education - less water usage.
126) Support policy remaining same – but would prefer other options found for drinking water.
127) Support current policy for recreation and irrigation, other alternatives like more usage of recycling water, desalination. Leave Logue Brook as is.
128) Look at long term alternatives, not short term like Logue.
129) Concern that the Health Department is only focusing on water quality as a health issue - what about the health benefits gained by recreation. It seems approx. 100,000 people use the dam as is - what good health benefits are they receiving from their social activities?
130) How much worse is it to have human faeces in the water system as opposed to all the animal impacts ie kangaroos, pigs, foxes, cats?
131) Clarification on the Shandy System of secondary storage - water movement between the dams - and it is feasible?
132) Is there a danger of cross-contamination of introduced fishes between catchments if piped water sharing between dams?
133) Why doesn’t illness occur from contamination of cross uses from existing non metro sources - in QLD country supplies?
134) What is the incremental - cumulative - cost to the overall cost of water if this minor source is not used?
135) The human risk factor - to health - is how negligible? What percentage of risk?
136) What is the risk of poly-carbonate piping contaminating the water supply in the future?
137) Is there a credible amount of research towards another alternate water sources - 100 year future. ie. Statewide pipelines, recycled water sources.
138) What is the future of recycling of water for industrial uses?
139) Continue research into triple use of water catchment uses - what studies have been completed?
140) What is the comparable water costs between Australian cities?
141) The bottled water supplied to the tables has passed the use by date. How will this affect our health and wellbeing.
142) A change in policy could be implemented at a higher cost for increased treatment and an acceptable risk to public health.
143) Increase the price of water to fund future recreation to offset closures, or fund the cost of increased treatment and ensure people reduce water use. Funding to police/security of water use ie. rangers to make sure people do the right thing in the catchment to minimise water quality impacts
144) Educate people in the water efficiency ie. shorter showers, and less garden watering.
145) Need to educate people in water quality impacts from recreation in catchments so they do the right thing.
146) Added fee for people to have swimming pool to discourage excess use of water.
147) Advertise water efficiency at key time slots on TV eg. 30 sec grab before news on all channels.
148) The wrong policy is being discussed here. The policy of water pricing is the problem. If water was more expensive, and water efficiency was adopted by all ie. no lawns, then Logue Brook water would not be in demand by the IWSS. Government has to not be scared to increase the price of water.
149) Look at opening up existing potable water catchment areas for limited recreational catchment use.
150) Look at population growth and limiting it to be more sustainable.
151) Presenters seemed to focus on unsuccessful/failed water treatment systems. Please present successful models as well as justification for water sources for the world that require treatment.
152) Are treatment systems being used in developing countries/regions being used here? If not, why not.
153) A slide was used stating all controls 'practicable' for ensuring water quality, then discussion occurred about using all controls 'possible'. Don't the presenters recognise these are two different and exclusive terms in risk management.
154) Why is Lake Argyle, a successful example of mixed use drinking water, not being explored?
155) What are the effects of native fauna impacting on water quality?
156) Fisheries spoke of the need to change the rules. How will these rules be policed in the catchment area?
157) Why is Survey number 1 a push poll? It immediately establishes and states the problem from the point of view of those that would like to see Logue Brook as a drinking water sources.
158) Point of clarification - has any valid WA or relevant research been undertaken that looks at what is the maximum human intervention in terms of recreation that can co-exist with drinking water catchment?
159) Does the Water Corporation classify 'health' of customers only in medical terms - not whole of person (lifestyle) health?
160) We are concerned that exception to the policy of protecting catchment areas - eg. for the purposes of Rally Australia may occur.
161) Difficult to think about policy changes and expanding catchment without considering the wider conservation issue - reduce consumption.
162) How far does 5 GL go in comparison to the systems usage? Especially in terms of future climate change.
163) Are we being overly cautious with protection of the public water supply - considering country kids have been drinking water from unprotected dams for years and remain healthy?
164) What is the difference in cost of treatment between the pristine water and water used for recreational uses, and who should pay - the consumer or the recreationist?
165) Can we separate between high risk and low risk recreational uses, and can we manage to reduce risks?
166) Activities like water skiing and four wheel driving, and power boating, bush walking are very much a family oriented activity and we don't want to lose them.
167) Can water be made potable after use by power boats?
168) Can water be over treated? What is the standard?
169) Can Wellington dam be used instead of Logue dam with desalination?.
170) Where mining has been done, can areas be converted to recreational /fishing?
171) Re-treatment of grey water needed.
172) Is Logue Dam within specs already for drinking water? Proportion that would need to be treated?
173) What is the additional cost for treatment of water in other areas where combined use is drinking and recreation?
174) How long would the demand for 5 GL be all that is required?
175) Is the proposed dam for the Brunswick River an alternative to closing Logue for recreational use?
176) Look at building a new dam for future use as drinking water - look at demand required in the future.
177) Government should be responsible for installing the pipe line for the use of irrigation not Harvey Water.
178) If the Corporation is to formulate a plan on Logue Brook Dam is it being tied in with the Harvey Dam? Then why has the Water Corporation not implemented the Harvey Dam source protection plan. Water quality protection, restrictive recreation. Accountability process is needed for implementing management plans.
179) Lack of accurate specific details of the causes and sources of human health problems arising from water pollution, specifically, the authorities need to show examples of where recreation has lead in the past to water quality problems leading to human health impacts.
180) Recognising that historically there has been a trend for irrigation water supply dams to be converted to drinking water dams, leaving only Drakesbrook and Waroona, where will the water-based recreational opportunities be moved to should these last two dams be closed to recreation?
181) What research has been done to assess the impacts of specific types of recreation on water quality and the resulting adverse impacts on human health in situations that are relevant to the Logue Brook Dam issue?
182) The WA govt has not committed itself to proper and effective management of recreation in water catchments (whereas Tasmania does this job effectively in recognition of the importance of its recreational fishing industry to tourism).
183) Why have various speakers compared chalk with cheese - why have they referred to catchments or water pollution incidents that have no bearing to the Logue Brook dam recreational usage issue? e.g. Sydney water supply dams' catchments are 50% cleared, have 60,000 people living in them and
have 8 sewerage treatment plants discharging into the catchment; the 3 pollution incidents mentioned by Water Corporation have no relevance to or bearing on the Logue Brook dam issue (Milwaukee was sewage contamination of a water supply lake, Swindon - inappropriate operation of a water filtration plant; Eagle-Vaile multiple failures of equipment plus sewage in upstream water source.

184) What studies have been done to qualify the number of people and types of recreation that will be displaced or otherwise impacted upon by a closure of the Logue Brook dam catchment to recreation?

185) The Department of Water failed to explain the process by which water-related policies such as those that control recreation in water supply dam catchments are reviewed and modified if necessary.

186) Minority view - many people in the public don’t realise the duty of care which lies on the shoulders of the water suppliers who are open to being sued if the water they supply causes illness or other problems to water users

187) Micro management is Ok, but what pressure is being put on governments to make the management more effective and relevant at the macro or overall policy level?

188) Should we support this band-aid solution (how long will this solution meet needs of the State?) or should we be aggressively pursuing a long-term sustainable resolution?

189) If the South West climate is progressively drier, why not source the water from a region which is actually getting wetter (ie the North West & Inland)?

190) What steps are being taken to repair the crumbling infrastructure and the losses incurred?

191) Can water supply be differentiated with high-quality water for drinking and lower-quality (grey?) water for other uses (irrigation, industry etc)?

192) Better control of wastage is needed?

193) Local people have been drinking from dual-use for years, no problem, no government interest. Why the sudden interest in quality now water it is to go to Metro area?

194) Is Water Corporation government or private corporation? Please clarify legality.

195) If drinking water becomes too pure, will this result in a lowering of our immune systems?

196) If water quality is so important to health, why do we have a primarily untreated unsecured water supply? To expect open catchments to remain pristine forever is naive in the extreme.

197) Fisheries - excellent presentation, relevant to community health and fitness issues, as well as recreation. Agree that an engineered solution should be considered.

198) Concerns that if too many catchments are totally prohibited then people will revolt and do more damage than they would in a managed situation - human nature. How many catchments do we have to close for this scenario to emerge?
199) After 40+ years of power boat use at Logue Brook, how long will it take to reduce pollutant levels in water, mud, soil to levels that are acceptable to the consumer?

200) A joint use trial is an excellent idea, especially if the resulting product is sent to Perth for trialling.

201) Has good management been considered when looking at the use of catchment areas as opposed to complete closure of catchment to people?

202) What is done to check industries in terms of using water efficiently as opposed to finding new water sources.

203) Relevance of data provided in some presentation. The data appears to be very selective.

204) Do we have the best up-to-date means of cleansing the water?

205) Other States have co-existing land uses (drinking water protection and recreation) - Why not WA?

206) Warragamba (NSW) does allow bush walking and overnight camping. That is contradicting statements made by some presenters.
Session 2 – Should the Logue Brook Dam proposal go ahead? If it does, and assuming recreation is prevented from continuing, what recreation opportunities do you think need to be developed at other dams in the Waroona and Harvey area?

Participants’ comments from each table

1) Is there a proposal to use Logue Brook to store south west Yarragadee water?
2) The proposed offsets do not offer anything for recreational fishing.
3) There are enough dams already for Perth. Conservation and sensibility, there should be enough to keep Perth going. There needs to be a better management system.
4) Brunswick Catchment Dam has allowed recreational fishing and marooning on that dam, so why not for Logue Brook?
5) Keep the current system and why not test the water quality before it gets into the Integrated Water Supply System (IWSS).
6) $1 million, is that the minimum amount? And will it be used to recreate existing Logue Brook facilities at other locations?
7) NWI is a source of funding for Harvey water.
8) Local industry benefits from multiple use of Logue Brook.
9) The offsets are insufficient, not well described?
10) If we lose access to Logue, we will never get it back, however if negotiated outcome (five year trial) we can be in a situation to review and further manage
11) $1 million carrot is not enough. The money should not come into it. It’s a buy off. Trust is an issue, look at the canoe issue. Should not offer money at all.
12) What are the local benefits from the proposal going through, other than a million $$ put in trust for safe-keeping? When locals cannot equitably access IWSS anyway (Coolup - $25k connection fee).
13) I do not believe the Water Corporation agenda, ever.
14) Water policy needs to be changed. Why not 5 year trial to prove or disprove potable water and recreation compatible.
15) Most people with an outgoing attitude would be more water wise and continue to pay for water to compensate to keep Logue brook.
16) Does the Govt really give a damn, got 4yrs left in term and do not want any drama, and taking the easiest option.
17) What about wastage in Perth!!! Reticulation particularly. Action needs to be taken against un-waterwise wasters.
18) $1 million is a cheap option and will go nowhere towards further infrastructure developments for recreation. What are the real cost of relocation etc?
19) There is no other option other than Logue Brook, so the proposed offsets are not real.
20) NO!!! Dam proposal should not go ahead unless it can be dual use.
21) The promise by Water Corporation of below dam improvements is considered false when compared with the below dam developments at Harding River Dam (Roebourne) and North Dandalup. Both below dam areas were set up but not maintained. Now either no water or no swimming in those areas. What guarantees are there that the same will not happen should the below Logue Brook area be developed.

22) The option of converting Logue Brook Dam to P1 is unacceptable given there are no alternatives presented for recreation fresh water use in regional Western Australia.

23) The Logue Brook dam is too important to the community as a recreational resource to have a total ban on recreational use. Why can't the money allocated for the Harvey Water Trade be used to develop more efficient water recycling or other such measures.

24) If Logue Brook is closed to recreation there is nowhere to go between Mundaring and Collie. It would be shutting off the whole region.

25) The price at the end of the day is too high!!! (Considering what will be lost).

26) Refer to Pinjarra/Brunswick "Shaping the Future" Removing Logue Brook flies in the face of the study which emphasises social & cultural values, Dec 2004. We should be increasing recreational opportunities instead of closing facilities!!!

27) $1M is not enough compensation. Who will it go to anyway?

28) Waroona is already overcrowded so where else could relocation go to?

29) How can we trust they will deliver on their promise? Will there be written agreement?

30) It was stated by the Water Corporation money should not come from just us, so who else then?

31) If ALL recreation activities are being transferred to Harvey and Drakesbrook has agreement been obtained from the local residents and neighbours to support this offer? How can a decision be made before this is done?

32) Recreational nodes were mentioned what is proposed to occur in these nodes to help with funding or make them economically viable? Residential/hotel/retail/commercial?

33) If Harvey and Drakesbrook are given over for recreational use as compensation, what guarantees will be given that they won't be reclaimed in the future for potable water.

34) We understand that there is capacity within Stirling and Samson Dams for additional water for IWSS in lieu of Logue Brook. Why are these options not being considered?

35) Can Samson and Stirling be converted to drinking water only and the other dams used for irrigation/recreation usage?

36) Has the Water Corporation got a vested interest in obtaining Logue Brook for drinking water (beyond the 5.3GL) and/or giving them potential to trade individually?

37) We are told that Logue Brook is the best option to access drinking water now. What is the timeframe from converting it to drinking water dam to
actual usage? How do the desalination plant and any other planned future sources add to the water supply?

38) Now that the State Govt has signed up to the National Water Strategy - isn't there greater capacity to fund alternatives to Logue Brook.

39) What measures could be used to increase catchment management and inflow into other dams? And would this impact on water quality?

40) Can we improve water quality at Harvey Dam to make it conducive to recreation and relocate services? And what is impact on Harvey residents and the town.

41) Minority view - Can we improve water quality at Harvey Dam to make it conducive to recreation?

42) Give community better incentives to conserve water and recycle?

43) If local dam proposal goes ahead existing recreation conditions should be amended.

44) No more recreation loss. As a local I know how often the area is enjoyed in summer and winter.

45) Water Corporation has a narrow point of view. There are too many social costs particularly to a small rural population who already miss out on many of metropolitan living. Economic view should not overrule other public/social needs. Past promises on water and dams have already been broken.

46) Camp Logue is a very important asset.

47) Logue can only become more important as a tourist asset.

48) Inflow to dams is not only a function of rainfall but is affected by Mining and other activities like deep ripping.

49) Before we leave how about a show of hands from the floor for all those who feel that Logue Brook Dam recreation should stay as it is now.

50) The cost saving of the Logue Brook water is approx 60c/kL. This equates to $3.18 million per annum - or 15c per month per Water Corp customer to keep Logue Brook Dam for recreation.

51) Is the Harvey Water Trade agreement dependent on Logue Brook dam?

52) If Logue Brook is not converted to drinking water, the extra cost of acquiring the 5GL from other sources (at a worst case cost of $1.20) is $3.18 million per annum - or $1.70 per annum per Water Corp customer - less than the cost of a single bottle of water.

53) Great emphasis is placed on preserving our natural environment for future generations. This issue is about preserving our quality of lifestyle for future generations. Why is that less important?

54) On what basis does Water Corporation assess the value of the social and community loss as being $1 million?

55) What does 5.3GL represent as a whole to Perth’s annual water consumption?

56) Would the million dollar offset offered be better spent on improving catchment management to increase inflow?

57) Is it feasible to take more potable water from Samson and Stirling dams and supplement the irrigation loss from Logue?
58) Is water level of Logue being manipulated to make it a more attractive looking option for the Water Corporation?

59) The social, economic, and recreational values CANNOT be quantified with the sale of 5.3GL and should be preserved and protected for the citizens as a whole.

60) Where did the figure of a million dollars come from?

61) Why can't they only treat the 5.3 GL of water instead of changing the whole area zone.

62) What is the current rating of Harvey Dam?

63) People in the south west pay 10c/L for fuel sent south, so then why don't Perth people pay more for water sent up?

64) Is Logue is only worth 1 million to the Water Corporation, then if so we think the local community will buy it!

65) Stay stable, the group agrees with the points raised by Department of Environment and Conservation.

66) What does the $0.60 include in relation to the water from Logue Brook?

67) The case presented by the Water Corporation did not consider in any way the needs of the community.

68) Which key indicators presented by the Water Corporation confirm their commitment to the people of Western Australia?

69) Why does the Department of Water and the Water Corporation consider economic well being is more important than community health and social well being?

70) The group strongly expresses a view of "NO CHANGE" for recreation at Logue Brook Dam!!!

71) Minority - Would the minister/s that are approving this project, approve the closer or restricting the use of a local park or recreational facility in their electorate?

72) What happens if Logue Brook Dam is not immediately included in the Harvey Water trade? Will part of the proposal still go ahead? i.e. from Stirling and Samson Dams?

73) If Water Corporation has nothing to offer why was $1 million offered? It seems an insulting offer.

74) The offer of Waroona, Drakesbrook and Harvey Dams for increased recreation is useless and not feasible as it has been stressed these are already inadequate and over utilised- what is your next move?

75) Logue Brook proposal should NOT go ahead.

76) Minority - Why not give priority to catchment thinning and other more effective means of collecting rainfall to increase dam inflows?

77) The stated low cost of water from Logue ignores the high cost of relocation of facilities. Has this capital cost been estimated to put a real cost on the water?

78) If the current trend on removal of water sport and recreational facilities continues, has any department modelled what the future facilities will be in say 20 years time and is there a master plan for this?

79) Is there any hard evidence of income into the broader Harvey community as a result of the Logue visitors?
80) There needs to be more research put into both drinking water resource and recreation activities.

81) No consensus on the proposal (50-50 split).

82) If there is overwhelming support to allow recreational activities to co-exist in drinking water catchment areas and there is a viable option available - is Water Corporation willing to change policy - yes/no?

83) For how long is 5GL of water going to support a community? How is this a long term solution?

84) Putting up $1m is going to save what? Rather tokenistic!

85) No point shutting off Logue Brook for recreation and relocating as other dams are already overcrowded. No study done to show they are not or what other offsets could be considered.

86) What is the saving of piping the system in the Harvey area, and why can't that saving be used in lieu of the 5.3 GL from Logue Brook?

87) It was said that "Back up supplies of drinking water in major cities are not protected" - so what treatment is used on this water to make it potable? So why is treatment an issue at Logue Brook?

88) If wasteful water consumption was addressed properly no one would be looking at converting Logue Brook to a drinking water facility.

89) In the Harvey Water background paper, as provided, a statement was made that is degrading and insulting to the community implying that recreationalists only come to "paddle and pee in the water on weekends". I find this extremely offensive.

90) NO - proposal should NEVER go ahead - leave Logue alone. Can't see that there is many opportunities for recreation at other dams in the district due to already overcrowding (Waroona) or unsuitable water (murky, algae) at Harvey.

91) The cheapest option is not always the best option. Believe that the extra 5.3GL could be taken from elsewhere - the social cost far outweighs economic benefit of cheaper production of water.

92) From a tourism point of view, there is no alternative to Logue Brook. Loss of Caravan Park, Camp Logue Brook, Hoffman Mill, Munda Bindi trail will result in tourists bypassing the local area (Yarloop to Brunswick). Distinct reduction of visitors to the area.

93) If the proposal goes ahead, recreational opportunities to be developed incl. a need for water ski area - Waroona dam overcrowded, access to Hoffman Mill would need to be improved and camping extended.

94) What is the incremental cost of the water to the consumer, by the inclusion of this water supply?

95) There is so little impact to the inclusion of this water supply into the grid - so as to be too valuable a recreation resource to loose.

96) There remains trust issues with Water Corporation - so as to question the integrity of promises made.

97) Short term there is consensus on no change or trade, but in the longer term options may be possible.

98) There is a concern that if drinking water declaration is made, and water use is taken for drinking, that future taking of water may be increased.
99) The triple or multi use catchments option is being slowly eliminated as a viable option.
100) Long term water options are still being ignored - the big state picture!!!! A dialogue on whole of state water options is required.
101) $1 million offset won't replace the value of the recreational facilities - you can't compensate for this.
102) Some Logue Brook recreational opportunities can be replaced by going elsewhere, but not all of them.
103) Water skiing is overloaded at Waroona, if more people, will require regulation of this activity to make it safe.
104) Creation of a man made water park in the Waroona/Harvey area would be considered as a possible offset to loss of recreation at Logue Brook Dam.
105) Other places are not the same as Logue Brook Dam's environs. Alternatives can be found but the Logue Brook experience cannot be replaced.
106) Minority view - There are alternatives and drinking water should be the priority.
107) This looks like it is the cheapest option, actual research needs to be done to understand the impact of dual use (recreation & drinking water).
108) What does the Government think is a reasonable cost for water, and how does this compare with other potable water prices in Australia?
109) It has been heard that the loss to water system leaks in the Perth network is approx. 9%. How much more is than the 5.3Gl you are looking at gaining from Logue Brook.
110) Without a shift in policy that allows for mixed use, the Logue Brook proposal should not go ahead.
111) If there is to be a change in policy, the community requires further information on how mixed use would be managed to ensure the continued high quality of scheme drinking water.
112) A concern exists that there is a tunnelled vision that water can only come from Logue Brook dam not elsewhere.
113) Regardless of what decision is to be made re Logue Brook Dam it would appear that much more money would need to be spent to improve recreational facilities within the region.
114) The consultation process is focussed very much on offset opportunities - not exploring co-existence.
115) Rather than suggesting dollar amounts to supplement facilities, it would be important to look at management plans for all recreation facilities in the area - now and into the future.
116) Acknowledged that the area is growing and there is a need and value for recreation facilities, but perhaps more stringent guidelines should exist to protect the environment at recreational facilities.
117) In view of what we heard, mining is even more of a concern, and has mining affected the inflow into the dam?
118) What water quality monitoring is occurring and what are the results, and how does Logue Brook compare to the other alternatives for recreation?
119) What were the factors in the costing for the new sources at $1.20 per kilolitre? Is it infrastructure, treatment or whatever?
120) Why can't we look at alternative water sources for WA, i.e. compulsory water tanks, no un-metered bores, treated stormwater?
121) Compulsory dual pipes for all new developments - grey water for toilet laundry, garden/industry where practicable.
122) Decision making needs to account for the needs of future generations, both in terms of recreation and potable water supply.
123) We need to be (re)educated about our overuse of water in most households so that we use less to begin with.
124) Why isn't Water Corp looking at the proposal of 45GL from Wellington dam?
125) Where do they expect the 60,000 current users of Logue Brook to go?
126) What is the current level of water quality of Logue Brook Dam?
127) Can water be treated to a potable level after water skiing?
128) What is the compensation to the existing permanent residents at Logue Brook going to be?
129) There is too much to loose if the proposal goes ahead, all for the sake of 5.3 GL of water.
130) What compensation would be made available to local ski clubs for relocation?
131) Concerns about overcrowding of existing facilities.
132) What research has been undertaken to look at other alternative recreational water based activities?
133) We lost faith in the process when people weren't allowed to respond to items that weren't honoured during the Harvey Dam construction (this came from a resident of the Harvey Dam).
134) That the Water Corporation needs to become responsible. Their obligations to their commitments to Harvey Dam were not done and that makes many of the questions today unanswerable.
135) $1 million will be an inadequate amount to pay for all reasonable compensations, e.g. the relocation of the caravan park will be much more expensive than this amount.
136) The Water Corporation has not completed nor made public its studies of the socio-economic impacts of this project.
137) Minority view - recreational usage of catchments was and is a secondary use of the catchments.
138) Water trade is no problem, but why not take it from where it's saved and not from Logue Brook?
139) Facilities may be poor in alternative areas, but isn't this just because managements have taken lots of money from the area and put nothing back in? What assurances do we have that the region will receive any compensating benefits (specific and tangible) from the proposal to close the dam?
140) Who owns Water Corp? From what position of ownership are they proposing to make an offer? An offer can only be made from the position of a finalised deal. Should he not, more properly, be making a request?
141) If ever-increasing population continues, why not take the people to the water, and not keep taking water to the people? Governments should be developing satellite cities with incentives like free land and tax breaks instead of continually loading up the available precious resources.

142) What department is responsible for the maintenance of the inflow system at catchments? What steps could be taken to improve the efficiency of the existing catchments?

143) This table strongly supports the views of community proponents of the benefits of active recreation for all ages. In what possible way could the loss of this natural & unique benefit to our lifestyle be compensated?

144) Water Corporation said they have no open cheque book. Do they have an open mind?

145) The summary provided by the Department of Environment and Conservation was very depressing. What pressure can you have on the Water Corporation to retain recreational areas like Logue Brook? Do you any power to make any assertions on our behalf?

146) Samson and Stirling Dam have already been taken away without a trade off and much consultation. The trade off for Logue Brook to Waroona, Drakes Brook and Harvey Dam is not fair or appears to be insufficient.

147) The Logue Brook Dam proposal should not go ahead. There are not enough alternatives available for relocating the recreational uses, and the community has already given up enough.