

Minutes

DRAFT Minutes of the Water Supply Augmentation - Community Working Group Meeting held Monday 15 February 2010

Venue:

Canvas & Kettle Meeting Room, Civic Centre
Tumbulgum Road, Murwillumbah

Time:

5.30pm - 9.00pm

Present:

Facilitator: Stuart Waters (Twyfords)
 Tim Mackney (Public Works)

Rob Learmonth (Tweed Coast);
Tony Thompson (Murwillumbah);
Samuel Dawson (Environment);
Richard Murray (Environment);
Robyn Lemaire (Water User); (part-time attendance)
Colleen Edwards (Landholder: Clarrie Hall Dam Area);
Joanna Gardner (Landholder: Byrill Creek Dam Area);
Don Beck (Business/Commercial);
Pryce Allsop (Business/Commercial);
Cllr Dot Holdom (Tweed Shire Council)
David Oxenham, Michael Wraight and Anthony Burnham (TSC staff);
Mark Hunting (MWH)
Geraldine O'Flynn (Southern Cross University) (arrived 5.50pm)
Rachel Eberhard (Tweed Heads); (arrived 6.35pm)

Guest speakers:

Jenny Pearson
Malcolm Bailey
Eddie Roberts
Paul Hopkins

Apologies:

Cllr Phil Youngblutt (Tweed Shire Council)
Jackie MacDonald (Aboriginal Advisory Committee)

Objectives:

To be a forum that will / where:

- establish and build positive relationships between the Council, key stakeholders and the broader community

- support two-way communication with key stakeholders and the broader community
- provide information to stakeholders and the broader community about the options, assessment processes and issues used to determine a preferred option
- provide feedback for stakeholders and the broader community on the options, assessment processes and issues used to determine a preferred option
- members can work together to identify environmental and community impacts of the options and to provide feedback on their prevention, minimisation and mitigation
- members can work together to identify opportunities for Council to communicate and consult with the broader community, and to provide feedback on the Council's consultation and communication plans and activities
- draft a report representing the views, interests and issues of members together with a summary of group recommendations for consideration by Council

Meeting commenced 5.40pm

1. Welcome by Stuart Waters.

Stuart reinforced to the group the goal of focusing on the social and environmental implications in relation to the 4 options.

Stuart then asked for the Group to briefly scan the minutes of the previous meeting for adoption.

Richard referred to point 29.3b in the question register regarding the capacity and depth of Clarrie Hall Dam and queried whether the conversation between Anthony and Tony after the last meeting on the topic should also be included in minutes.

Anthony responded that he is addressing this question but it will take a little more time to provide a better approximation of the proposed dam volume.

Stuart recognised the question raised was outside the meeting itself and is therefore not appropriate to be included in the minutes.

Minutes of Previous Meeting:

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the DRAFT Minutes of the Water Supply Augmentation - Community Working Group Meeting held Monday 1 February, 2010 be accepted as a true and accurate record of the proceedings of that meeting.

Moved: Cllr. Dot Holdom
Seconded: Rob Learmonth

Business Arising:

Joanna requested a full EIS be undertaken on council land.

Tim responded that this is outside Council's resources to undertake an EIS before the preferred option is selected. Once selected, a full EIS must and will be undertaken on that option.

Joanna added - How can CWG come up with a conclusion without all the information? Even Margaret Balandin from Water Options said there was not a full enough assessment, so there needs to be more data gathered.

Colleen requested a sectional plan be made available for what the proposed plan of the new CHD wall and slipway is to look like.

Tony asked if this group is not making a decision but only a recommendation on the preferred option – does that mean that our recommendation will not be followed?

David responded that Council will make the final decision. Council will then need to go through the entire process of an EIS and follow the relevant legislation prescribed. Therefore Council will look at the option recommended, assess all of the information and determine the path forward.

Don agreed with David. He said we have known all along that Council makes the decision. It has been discussed at each of the 3 meetings to date, is in the Terms of Reference and the 4th point in the question and answer handout to the public, headed “Who Decides?” also states that Council ultimately makes the decision – the CWG is gathering the advice.

Colleen asked how does council take the CWG’s recommendations into account?

Dot responded by explaining she sees her position on the CWG chiefly as an observer to gather info and disseminate to Council – which is part of the transparency to come to a decision. She referred to the Terms of Reference No. 4: Roles and Responsibilities which states “The CWG is consultative in nature. It is not a decision making body. Decision making powers are retained by Tweed Shire Council.” She does not take that decision lightly and wants to make the best decision. She will take the recommendations of the CWG back with her as part of the deliberations.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the DRAFT Notes of the Water Supply Augmentation - Community Working Group Site Visit held Monday 1 February, 2010 be accepted as a true and accurate record of the proceedings of that site visit.

Moved: Cllr Dot Holdom
Seconded: Colleen Edwards

Business Arising:

Joanna provided late amendments to the notes on the field trip made. These will be circulated to the group

Agenda Items:

- 1. Overview of the process from here. A plan for the final two meetings.**
Stuart

Stuart talked through his powerpoint slide show (attached).

- So Far: a brief overview of what the group has achieved so far
 - Looked at Dam options in some detail
 - Identified key environmental issues
 - Provided input on the relative significance of those issues for each of the two dam options
 - Raised broader concerns for consideration and extended the ToR

- The task ahead: summary of the main steps in the process
 - Weight the criteria – how important are the environmental and social criteria?
 - Rate the options – how should they be rated in terms of their environmental and social impacts?
 - Provide your rationale for weightings and ratings
 - Provide advice on the important things Council needs to consider in considering water supply augmentation – “caveats” to the recommendations

- Today: the focus of today’s meeting
 - Social issues, what are the most important, for which option?
 - Further data on the environmental issues
 - Data on the two pipeline options
 - Review and agree on the key enviro and social ‘criteria’.
 - Refresher on the multicriteria analysis tool
 - Agree on the reporting process.

- Meeting Five: what to achieve in the last meeting
 - Review what we’ve learned
 - As individuals and then as group, weight the enviro and social criteria. Provide rationale.
 - As individuals and then as group, rate the four options in terms of impact on their enviro and social criteria.
 - Identify key issues for consideration by Council, and provide advice.
 - Finalise messages for the report.

Discussion took place during Stuart’s presentation:

Tony asked if the report is to be ignored where will it be published? Why are we here? This appears to be a total farce.

Anthony responded the report is intended to be put on public display so that the broader community can use it as another resource and take that information into account. In respect to the final multi criteria analysis, it will be an appendix within the final report that goes to council. It will not be ignored.

Tony asked what if our caveats say we don’t want council’s choice? If the CWG goes to council with its recommendations saying for example we want option 1 and council says option 3, then Tony objects to that. Tony stated he was appalled if that’s what can happen.

Dot responded to Tony – I’m somewhere between offended and angry. Remember my question to David in the last meeting? What happens with the CWG recommendation?.

The CWG is not the final decision maker - Council takes the recommendations from the CWG on board. Dot said she doesn't know what the final outcome is going to be. By asking David those questions in the last meeting – Council will consider the recommendations by the CWG within the report and through the bureaucrats who will produce a report to Council. We are all working for the one thing at the end of the day. Ideally Council needs the CWG to say this is the option it thinks is the best choice. There is a process which needs to be followed.

Stuart advised this is the opportunity for the Group to provide further input by addressing ratings, weightings and making further comment, to assist council in its decision.

Richard stated there was a key issue when talking about the environment – are we talking about natural, man-made? We need to know what you mean by environmental and social aspects.

Stuart advised that Mark will address different aspects of the environment, within his presentation later in the evening.

Colleen asked if the Councillors decide not to follow the recommendations by the CWG, does Council need to explain why? Do Councillors have to explain why they made the decision they made?

Dot explained that Councillors are given business papers and the public is entitled to a copy also. The papers are available online – and anyone is able to make further comment. The CWG report will go to the council officers and become a report that then goes to public exhibition and everyone is entitled to make a submission. She recommended the CWG Members come to community access and watch and observe the process – how Council talks about the issues.

Colleen asked is the voting anonymous? Do Councillors need to give reasons why they vote one way or the other?

Dot said that Councillors do not have to give reasons as such, however it can be seen in the debate which occurs before a resolution. Each Councillor's decision and vote is recorded publically on a screen using voting buttons. There are 7 Councillors – it is a transparent process.

Rob suggested one thing that may help the Group feel that the work being done by the Group is productive and will be heard is to make the CWG report part of the total EIS report. He suggested that if people are feeling their work is devalued, it would assist to ensure the information must be taken into account. Rob made a Motion to move:

That the record and recommendations of the CWG Group made to Council be included to form part of the EIS report.

MOVED: Rob Learmonth
SECOND: Robyn Lemaire

The **motion was carried** by a strong majority.

Don stated this decision is for the future – we need to put trust into our Councillors – we have not looked at the big picture of the whole of the Tweed Shire.

Stuart then asked for Cllr Holdom to remain timekeeper for the presentations and reiterated to the presenters and all CWG Members to keep focus on key issues.

2. Presentations on social impacts and discussion:

2.1 Byrrell Creek

Joanna briefly introduced her guest speakers, Jenny Pearson & Malcolm Bailey

2.1.1. Jenny Pearson - (speaker on behalf of inundated people) All of their statements (including those not presented are attached).

Jenny's presentation focussed on the severe social effects that would be caused by the inundation of the Byrrell Creek valley. Some points included:

- Representing 14 people and can provide statements from all
- Some people not compensated due to caveats on their land regarding future dam
- Few rentals available
- Lifestyle changes
- No car if access road goes
- Peaceful environment
- Survive the valley for future generations
- Habitat destroyed
- Concerns for water quality
- Little flow downstream
- Flora and fauna
- Difficult to leave what we have built over years – displacement
- Aboriginal sacred sites – preserved sites
- Raised here and choose to stay
- Children to live in a beautiful environment
- Will the owner get real market value – loss of rental property
- Objective to live here and be self-sufficient

Jenny expressed disappointment and anger at not being able to read out all of the statements. The people in her community had provided her with their individual statements which she wanted heard.

Richard asked to receive a copy of all presentation letters/responses.

Cllr Holdom agreed with Richard and requested copies be made available for the Group and a copy for the Councillors.

Tony said that the CWG have a lot of sympathy for what Jenny was saying – we are very supportive of your views unfortunately, we have time constraints. However please be assured that the CWG will read all of the statements and consider them as if they were presented on the night.

Stuart thanked Jenny.

2.1.2 Malcolm Bailey (impacts of living adjacent to the construction of a dam wall)

Points raised in Malcolm's presentation include (refer attachment):

- Lives 300m from proposed wall
- He and his family have lived for at Byrill Creek for 16yrs on 5 acres
- My property is council compliant – property searches when he purchased the land showed there were no constraints on the property.
- Concerned with stability of geology: - Blasting the hills with dynamite – vibrating rollers, shock waves, 24hr earthmoving equipments
- Direct impacts from construction – noise, stress to local koala, dust, seismic monitoring for explosive, massive earthmoving equipment, reduction in animals – an area described as the last remaining jewel in the Tweed Valley is at risk.
- Environmental issues
- 10 or more homes affected and a hotel
- 4 houses and motel within 500m dam
- No houses within that range for CHD wall
- If dam wall was to break thru earthquake how many lost?
- Who wants to live where large scale construction is going on?
- How could I relocate?
- Where would I go?
- Who would want to rent?
- Devaluation of my property

2.1.3 Joanna Gardner (social impacts for Byrill Creek & survey information)

Joanna provided statistics on the survey she had conducted and reported previously. However she concentrated on the social impacts on affected landholders. Refer to survey. She outlined following points (refer handout):

- Inundation 6 dwellings
- 2 caveats
- Property access and roads – big issue - Council has been asked where would the alternate access roads be
- Longer access road more maintenance and cost.
- Impact on privacy.
- Split the front end from backend of valley
- Access to Mebbin National Park restricted
- Cut off from community erodes social fabric of the valley
- Divisiveness within the community
- Adequate compensation – real estate values being depreciated. Public works document outline Byrill Creek dam costs. Only \$2.4m is set aside for road and dam? This can't be correct.
- Burden of caveats for future dam.
- Commercial tree plantations will be affected
- Tourism
- Aboriginal cultural heritage
- Social feeling

- Disruption of essential services

Questions:

Stuart thanked the presenters and asked the Group what did we hear from these three presentations?

Don said he would like to hear from the whole of Tweed Shire. What is best for the overall public good?

Sam said he sensed people had a strong connection living at Byrrill Creek (some for 20 & 30yrs). That caveats placed on properties would affect fair compensation.

Rob agreed with Don that the overall public good needs to be considered, but stated preserving what is at Byrrill Creek is in the public good. That the environment at Byrrill Creek should remain as it is.

Robyn asked Malcolm about the impact on property values.

Malcolm responded that he was not a professional in that field, but if he tried to sell tomorrow – who would want to buy land 300m from the dam wall?

Don reiterated that he has always said that Council must make sure fair compensation is addressed, not just the Valuer General's figure.

Colleen responded that not everything equates to a dollar value.

Malcolm said, its not a cash value – My family and I want to live there for the rest of my life.

Don said but you must have realised that the land was affected when you purchased?

Malcolm responded that his property was never affected when he bought it – it is now considered to be within the buffer to a proposed dam. Malcolm and his family are able to live off the water from his own catchment - he can't see why other residents in the Shire can't live like this also?

Pryce said the issue is about future population of the Shire. He feels for the land, the animals, and the people affected, but the issue is not whether 75,000 people are moving here but when – and with that comes how do we supply them with water.

Malcolm responded "It's in your interests Pryce, because you sell home improvements"

Pryce said I'm not saying I want a dam at Byrrill Creek, this is bigger than you or I.

Why are we looking at 36,000 MegaLitres (the larger option) when 19,000 MegaLitres is forecast for growth to 2025?

This question was referred to Question Register.

Don said we need to look at how many people are coming here.

Joanna asked if anyone watched ABC 7.30pm report? Our water supply cannot support the population predictions for Australia currently being discussed. Can we support this sort of population growth? She doesn't believe so. Has anyone looked at a population cap – not even an option.

2.2 **Clarrie Hall Colleen Edwards**

Points raised in Colleen's presentation include (refer attachment):

- Concern about quality of water stored.
- Still body will rise 8.5m – flooded 1.2km upstream, therefore an expansion of still water Salvinia will need to be addressed and blue green algae too
- 10 properties severely impacted/land acquisition required.
- One property owner will almost certainly lose his home.
- Some properties cut into segments - access in jeopardy.
- Approx 20 properties affected in various degrees.
- Zoning states land cannot be cut into less than 100 acres.
- Farmers cannot farm.
- Most farmers productive land is in the buffer zone or under water.
- Stress and anxiety for the community - Will CHD be raised?
- This has impacted on every decision we have made – we remain in limbo.
- Replacing McCabes bridge - A bridge of approx 150m length 6m above would need to be considered.
- If buffer zone retained at 5m fewer properties would be impacted.
- Diverse as our background's are in this community – its mateship that unifies us – all the valley is invited to join in – and this community spirit will remain no matter what.

Questions:

Stuart thanked Colleen for her presentation and asked the Group to sum up.

Sam stated there appears to be ongoing stress and anxiety in CHD community.

Colleen responded by saying the question asked all the time “Is it going to happen or not” is constantly hanging over our head. Every decision made, like replacing a fence, the question asked is this a waste of money?

Sam also said a 7m buffer zone appears to be excessive.

Tony asked whether there is any information on the construction of the dam? We have been told the costing is approx \$30m. Wants reassurance on geology as there is concern over the stability. Building a dam is one thing, expanding is another. It could put Uki at risk.

Joanna stated that her guest speakers were very distressed at not being able to complete their presentation and proposed that the speakers be able to deliver all

information they have and cut back the question time. She conveyed that her speakers were very frustrated with the 5 mins.

Don said he had received information on the time limit of the presentations and everyone was fully aware of the 5 mins & question time – it should stay the same.

Joanna said she has never seen anything as rude and ignorant as the way those three people were treated tonight.

Stuart concluded that it was not fair to the remaining speakers nor the CWG to change what had been agreed. It was a difficult situation, but there were still a number of speakers and discussions that had to occur tonight.

2.3 Environmental Issues for consideration

2.3.1. Samuel Dawson - Eco Tourism and its economic potential.

Points raised in Samuel's presentation include (refer attachment):

- Tweed tourism generated over \$330m last year & over 1600 fulltime jobs
- Tweed eco-tourism 5.8% gross product
- Downside on the Tweed is high unemployment at 42%
- Urgent need for strategies for employment growth
- Away from simple rezoning land drives and an unsustainable service based economy.
- BCD has potential as eco tourism to see this area.
- Potential to develop compatible activities eg mountain bike racing, there's great potential at Byrill Creek.
- Emphasising eco tourism benefits in this area as it exists today.
- Crams farm – excellent tourism place on weekends. If the dam is raised, 50% of this area will go under. Council needs to locate similar areas for the community to enjoy.

2.3.2 Eddie Roberts - Effects to business

Points raised in Eddie's presentation include: (refer attachment)

- Society is affected by any of these proposed developments.
- A Uki study showed that the community wants sustainable developments- to get this we need to look at demand management first. The timetable for these projects is too quick to allow demand management to take effect.
- All new developments should have 20,000L on site rainwater storage.
- If we were to do that we don't need anymore infrastructure. Dams in construction create huge greenhouse gas emissions and water quality issues.
- BCD has many values other than storing water, aside from environmental, the affect on community, on Uki and losing an economic area. Not just water for the coast.
- Say we double the size of our population in 30yrs - then what do we do?
- Need to develop longterm jobs in these areas – we have to develop sustainably.

- The worlds population cannot keep going – now is the time to be serious – sustainable development not for short term construction jobs – the coast will be affected, the environment will be affected.

2.3.3 Paul Hopkins - Broader social impacts

Points raised in Paul's presentation include: (refer attachment)

- Trained as town planner and has done some sociological training
- The process adopted by Council is not a genuine approach. You can't start with 4 options at the 11th hour
- Everything should be on the table and start from scratch.
- I found this very strange I had to sit outside. Even when you go to court you can sit in – I found this very disrespectful. Felt like treated like a dog.
- Direct and indirect sociological impacts
Direct affects on Heritage – Crams Farm is known as a heritage farm relict – part of our heritage. Most of that would be wiped out. How are you going to resurrect that which the community has put into it?
- Byrrill Creek has had a lot of work done on environmental rehabilitation – time and money spent - people have sociological attachment to this environment.
- Tourism - People do go from a drive to Uki – Both Uki and Tyalgum will suffer from closure of the road.
- Huge amount of money spent at Bray Park. If you have a facility that can treat additional potable water you want to treat the maximum in order to keep that investment rolling - thus need to secure supply. These dams will have a lot of damaging side effects. There is no money to spend in rainwater tanks because you've spent all money on Bray Park treatment plant.
- People need to be responsible and get away from this wasteful approach to water. Paul is responsible for all his own sewage and water use.

Tony apologised to the presenters for having to wait outside.

Rob asked why have we not conducted an ESD?

Tim responded that the process of the MCA is trying to address this with the quadruple bottom line assessment of the 10 criteria.

Rob suggested that the MCA is a component of this report.

Joanna asked each of the presenters to give one issue that they believe is the most important?

- Sam – the need for self reliance and interdependence.
- Eddie – same but with + 20,000 litres for rainwater tank storage
- Paul – agreed both and said that given the Federal governments generosity with rebates we should all be putting in as big a tank as possible

Tony asked what do you think is a sustainable population in the Tweed Valley?

- Eddie responded by saying I doubt it should be double what it is now

- Paul believes we have already exceeded it. You can measure it any number of ways including no parking spots, roads clogged
- Sam said this project is attempting to increase the carrying capacity of the Tweed. Why are we increasing population and eating into our environmental credits?

2.4 Population - Tony Thompson

Tony firstly read out a statement:

“We should leave our planet in a better state than when we arrived.”

Points raised in Tony’s presentation include: (refer attachment):

- Population statistics;
- Impacts of increased population
- Residential developments
- Policing requirements to double
- Employment
- Referred to recent article in SMH about Australia’s future population”
- Cost of new developments worries him which he believes is borne by existing residents not the new ones coming in.
- Conclusion – a comprehensive plan needs to be addressed.

Questions:

Don asked Tony about the reference made to SMH article. Did anyone read the article in the Daily News last week about affordable housing? Tweed has the highest priced land outside Sydney and Melbourne.

Richard informed the group that documentation about stamp duty between 2007-2009 states the number of houses halved under \$500K. So, in actual fact we are not increasing as much as we think.

Pryce provided an observation statement about population - Whilst we don’t want more people coming here – it is going to be inevitable - we are going to have change – how are we going to cope with the increasing population? – this place is going to change whether we like it or not.

Tony informed the group that population control has been implemented successfully in the Lakes District in England to the benefit of the environment and existing population.

Return from Dinner Break at 7.38pm

2.5 Social and Environmental Issues for SEQ pipeline & Contingency option - Mark Hunting

SEQ Pipeline Option – slide show (attached)

- Environmental
- Greenhouse
- Social acceptability

Mark asked group to refer to notes regarding SEQ pipeline which has been assessed based on three possible alignments

- Based on info from Council's consultation with government agencies
- the third alignment through Cobaki appears to have the least issues
- NPWS identified issues for wildlife for alignments along Tugun bypass.
- The Alignment A has higher risks/problematic
- Qld Main Roads Dept has rejected any pipeline development following the Tugun bypass – they have already rejected Telstra's application for cabling.

Colleen asked what is SEQ response to a pipeline for water?

Sam asked would they let out enough water for Tweed residents?

Mark confirmed the SEQ Water Grid Manager confirmed 20megaL per day is possible, however stressed that there is no confirmation that they will supply the water. SEQ is currently reviewing its own situation in the wake of the Traveston dam decision.

Richard said the closest connection to SEQ water grid is Coolangatta and that you can't connect directly to the desalination plant.

Mark advised Council had requested water from the SEQ water grid which is not necessarily water from the desalination plant but could be from anywhere on the grid (eg Hinze Dam, Tugun desal. Plant, etc).

Joanna heard there were problems with the Tugun desalination plant?

Rachel advised she had a total aversion to connect to the large grid. Whether it was from the desal plant or not, there was huge energy consumption associated with connecting.

Sam queried whether the pipeline alone could that replace a dam option? Richard asked what size pipe is required for 20 MegaLitres?

Mark confirmed that the pipeline would supply enough water to avoid the need for a dam. The pipe would be a 500mm diameter.

Colleen asked whether the price of water would be a set price?

Mark – Yes we believe so - However contractual arrangements have not been sorted out.

Richard asked isn't the Cobaki developer going to need to provide a pipeline to supply the development anyway?

Anthony replied yes they are however the developer will only provide enough to supply that development, but will not be a large enough pipe to provide 20ML/d as required.

Tony asked how have SEQ excess water when they have been on restrictions?

Mark referred to his response to the group during the first meeting where he explained that the combined capacity of the system is far greater than just the sum of the individual parts. All the data suggests there is more than adequate capacity

Rob stated that option looks like dead to him. Rob then said he believed Rous Water would look forward to a partnership with Tweed.

Response - Part of the combined option of pipeline to Rous water together with smaller pipeline to SEQ and groundwater.

Mark advised previously this combined option is a lot of money- the combined contingency option can not have any number 1's to hold it up.

Colleen asked what height would the pipe be above above sea level?
Mark replied maybe 1 or 2m.

Sam said if all developments are mostly happening on the coastal strip, these pipelines on the coast appear the better way to go to him. As far as the lesser evils go this option is better if all developments are on the coast.

Rachel asked if there is more information on groundwater resources. Is it a yield estimate?

Mark responded that we relied on the expert's report attached to the Coarse Screening Report which was yield based and that is as far as we have gone.

Richard stated SEQ is drawing 30 megaL/day from their groundwater.
Mark responded that the cost of local treatment and groundwater is high. The preferred location would be upstream of the Bray Park Water Treatment Plant. The report also showed that Tweed's groundwater supplies are not able to provide the quantity of water required.

Joanna indicated that her understanding is that as far as Aboriginal cultural heritage issues go, drawing from groundwater is not good. She believes it should be weighted as no.1 – high risk.

Sam added traditional farmers indicate that groundwater use could have significant impacts on them.

Rachel would like to clarify what we are going to do for next meeting?

Stuart responded that we had discussed it earlier in the evening, and would look at it again later in the evening

3. Presentation and discussion of the new matrix

Tim presented the Exel matrix designed by Council officers and MWH (including Mark Kingston) following the CWG's site visits at the last meeting (see attached).

- Two matrices – one for environmental impacts and one for social impacts.
- They are split into sub criteria to give the CWG a better feel for the data.
- Discussion was based on the blank matrix to show the categories
- A matrix with all of the data will be sent to committee by end of this week.

Discussion on the sub-criteria (attributes):

Loss of threatened flora & fauna species - Joanna asked would that be 5 or 10km?
Tim responded that's something we can talk about to set a parameter.

Rachel asked how do we deal with uncertainties?
Tim responded it is to be reflected in comments column.

Tony asked for clarification ie Is it a loss of a number of species, is that species unique to that area, extinction?
This sub-criteria is particularly difficult to quantify given that its records are based on opportunistic sightings and reports for adjacent developments.

Richard said Aboriginal Cultural Heritage is not even mentioned.

Tim acknowledged Richard was correct. David added that Council had made a conscious decision to keep that as a separate request, the social aspects are not covered. This has come at the request of the Aboriginal Advisory Committee.

Cllr Holdom advised she sits on the Aboriginal Advisory Committee - they are not backward in coming forward. We are not aboriginal and they don't want to have us as "mission managers". They will address it in their own way.

Mark suggested Eco tourism to be included in Social matrix.

Rachel asked how is upstream and downstream defined?
Tim responded that direct inundation is upstream and downstream is riparian vegetation area and changes to flow regimes.

Joanna asked to have the list of threatened species records inserted.
Tim said it could be done as a 1 page attachment.

Sam would like to add environmental consciousness as a holistic entity and believes it is useful to measure because Byrrill Creek catchment has a greater environmental concern than a pipeline through a coastal area.

Richard stated he drove along Cobaki Parkway and on one side there is a proposed residential development and on the other, wetlands – where is the exact location of the proposed pipeline?

Anthony advised it would be in the road reserve.

David also added wherever a road ends up there would have already been an environmental disturbance – that is the context for the discussion of the pipeline route, that development process having already been approved.

Joanna referred to the survey and the feeling questions in regard to what Sam was saying before. Where are these values?

Rob stated the term cultural landscape is not purely just an aboriginal term. Cultural landscape is a belief system, an attachment to the land and it is a philosophy.

Tim suggested this may not be measurable as an impact under a criterion, but perhaps we can address its importance under the weightings? There is nothing to say that the CWG can not decide that 10ha at one site is more important than 100ha at another. This is up to the CWG to decide.

Stuart asked if a criterion of cultural landscape could be used to choose A from B?

Sam agreed and said it could reflect his own values.

Stuart asked to take the data that will be sent in the completed matrices and think how important this is to the community, whether high, med, low. To explore the meaning for each of these options. It is a tool to help the group understand the sub-criteria / attributes so that it can have a position on the environmental and social criteria.

Colleen asked Mark to explain what he meant on the field trip by building a wall at the upper end of Byrrill Creek? Mark said he had mentioned building a saddle dam at the top of the catchment to control a spill from the dam. Joanna asked if any costing has been done on that and Mark responded No.

Tony asked if we have any figures on fish stocks ?

Tim replied that Council did not have any data and that is why the area of riparian vegetation that will be affected will be an important indicator to help assess those types of impacts also.

Stuart focus on environmental impact – can we add the following 2 to the matrix?

Sedimentation

Water quality

Joanna said there was nothing on the construction phase. This is a huge impact – both social and environmental. There are traffic, noise, water quality problems etc.

Anthony suggested to leave a few blank spaces to identify any extra criteria and share at the next meeting. The whole idea is to get the environmental/social issues together to decide relativity.

Rob added what about security of supply? Isn't that why we're here? Response was that this has a criteria of its own (refer Options Report).

Tim will supply the matrices with all of the available data by the end of the week and will include 2 additional blank rows at the bottom. CWG members can add additional issues that are important to you. Bring it next week.

Tony felt that this is a complete waste of time. This just goes onto a record? Have we been asked to make a decision? We've been given little guidelines. He can't see how he is supposed to supply the group with these huge amounts of information.

Joanna disagreed and said this will help us to look at the analysis with more information. Tim will supply us with the matrices with all the information contained in

them. We can analyse this and compare between the options to help us make our recommendations.

Don asked where is this information coming from?

Response: from Council's data bases and GIS system. Some data is more reliable than others and will be noted in the comments column of the matrices.

4. Review of the MCA tool – review rating & weightings

Mark recapped his slideshow (attached) showing triple and quadruple bottom line criterion. We can group our 10 criteria into 4 to show the quadruple bottom line.

For rating the options, 1 is very high (degree of difficulty) and 5 is reasonably straightforward etc.

However, on the weightings it is the reverse, 1 is very low (relative level of significance). The method is rating x weighting gives the score. This is what will be done with the final analysis in the report to be presented to council.

We want to embrace the 10 criteria. The more criteria we have the greater dampening affect we have. The terms of reference for this group is to look at green (environmental) and blue (social) but in determining the final MCA, Mark will also be looking at red (economic) and yellow (governance) to determine a preferred option.

Tony expressed his concern at the multiplication effect – it is a subjective number. Mark responded it amplifies the difference between one to the other.

5. The report – discussion on how this might work, roles and responsibilities

Stuart stated the job of this group is to create a draft report.

Stuart outlined the approach for the report:

- The ratings and weightings numbers will form the key output
- This will satisfy many of the aims from the original Terms of Reference.
- Also included will be any additional advice, issues raised, key points raised, and caveats.

Rachel outlined a list of prompts she has drafted to structure these comments ie assumptions, process, MCA.

Anthony agreed with Rachel's prompts.

Tim presented a broad outline for the report's main headings:

- Introduction
- Process followed
- CWG Recommendations
- Additional Issues

Tony suggested we submit our caveats before the next meeting.

Richard suggested Stuart begin with an outline or skeleton of the report and let the Group add comment to it. If you set out the report and let the Group add comments, we can save a lot of time.

Stuart advised Rachel has got the beginnings of a structure and then asked “How do we come to a consensus as a group?”

Rob asked is it a consensus process, democratic decision making - how?

Tony asked when do our codicils come into it?

Stuart advised we are going to have a discussion on how to reach that point. He suggests a big long list of issues is produced where the members can list the issues that interest us. Then through consensus we select a top 5 for the core of the report.

Joanna said it will be difficult to produce a general document for submission to community. How do we make the community understand these issues? Joanna believes there needs to be a written accompaniment for a member of the general public to understand.

Rachel suggested maybe a one page summary with attachments to refer for more detailed information.

Stuart said that in his experience what has worked well previously is:

- a single page summary
- a 5 page summary report
- the report with all attachments

Pryce pointed to the chart and said once we have submitted our answers – it will give Council an idea where we are coming from.

Tim suggested to the Group, the more common ground we can find, the more power in the report. It sends a powerful a message. However any focussed information that can be provided is step in the right direction.

Richard said we had to consider 3 options – I thought there was also the 4th – it is not in the schedule.

Mark said we can't apply the MCA to the contingency option. It is something different from the 3 options.

Anthony added we would appreciate any environmental and social insight into this. The numbers are about 3 options and we need to be clear about ratings and weightings.

6. Homework – Review all the social and environmental impacts. Come ready to discuss these and weight and rate the options. Think about the key messages for Council

Minutes

Stuart requested the Group to take the matrix when Tim sends it to them and look at the data – look at all options whether they have a high or low impact.

Rachel outlined her structure/format which will include :

Assumptions: Comment on population growth and water usage

Process: Comment on Council's attempt at the community engagement process ie from 12 options to 4 to 1 option; The time allocated and time in this group; Future process from here

MCA: Comment on overall criteria and weightings, ratings x 3 options, comments on 4th option, evidence based, additional issues and process going forward.

Tony agreed that he could find a place for his caveats in that type of breakdown.

Stuart advised the Group it is Tim's role to produce the final report. It would be beneficial to start a discussion about wording around the points above.

Colleen asked why we are looking at both the smaller and larger options for Byrrill Creek Dams?

Tim responded that the smaller dam is big enough for the planning period to 2036 after that its whether the second size dam provides economies of scale from an economic viewpoint, ie do we do one big dam once or go a smaller dam and potentially raise it later?

Tony definitely wants an answer to the volume/capacity of CHD in order to make a decision. Anthony replied he is hopeful to provide Tony with the method described by end of week.

Don asked exactly what would happen if council decide to do nothing and not go with any of the options?

Anthony responded with the current amount of zoned land (TSC LEP2000), it can yield the population figures that we have been talking about and unless that changes, we will be dealing with population of that quantum, at some stage in the future. If Council does nothing then there will not be enough water.

Joanna stated we have a dam costing \$58m - the State coffers are empty – where is the money coming from to build this dam?

David replied all projects are funded by TSC and contributions made by developers.

Rachel will forward an issues list to Tim.

Tim will circulate to the Group and request all contributions to be received by him no later than Monday morning 22 February.

General Business:

Stuart asked for one word to sum up the evening:

Mark Harder push on the quantifier matrix

Don: Contribution made by speakers, added nothing to what we already know

Minutes

Tim: Progress
Rob: Progress
Richard : Skeleton plans ready for next week
Tony: Pleased by Rachel's issues list
David: Better
Pryce: Progressing
Dot: Remains hopeful
Sam: Coalescence of ideas
Anthony: Progress
Joanna: Emotionally disturbed by tonight
Colleen: Extremely enlightening
Rachel: Frightened when I came in -less frightened now
Stuart; Progress

Next Meeting:

The next meeting of the Water Supply Augmentation - Community Working Group Meeting will be held Monday 1 March 2010 at 5.30pm at the Canvas and Kettle Room, Civic Centre, Murwillumbah.

The meeting closed at 9.55pm.