

Appendix 4

Empty page

Comments from members of the citizens' group in response to the four questions suggested by Jesper Christoffersen in the meeting invitation

Re 1: Is it necessary to take additional steps to protect the groundwater, watercourses and the bay?

- 1.1 Groundwater should be protected against percolating pollutants of human origin, which include man-made chemical compounds not found in nature (pesticides, fertilisers, household cleaning agents, factory chemicals, oil products, etc.) and unnatural amounts **and** concentrations of natural pollutants (manure, sewer sludge, etc.) In this connection, organic fertiliser from animal farm factories should be concentrated and processed before it leaves the premises.
- 1.2 We should not abstract so much groundwater that there is a risk of salination due to salt water seeping into the groundwater deposits in coastal areas. Copenhagen should be forced to conserve the water not used for drinking, bathing or other types of human hygienic activity. Large housing complexes should reuse their water.
- 1.3 The watercourses near Frederikssund should be maintained by municipal and county authorities much better than has previously been the case, and there should be people appointed whose responsibility it is to ensure this maintenance work is done. If they do not do their job, then they should be sacked and replaced by others who act more responsibly. This also applies in the case of creeks running into the Roskilde Fjord bay. It will not do that a lack of responsibility and hydrodynamics knowledge is accepted as a reason for, among other things, poor discharge conditions from the creeks (e.g. Havelse Creek) into the bay.
- 1.4 The quality of the water in Roskilde Fjord and the currents near the coasts must be treated with greater care so the good flora and fauna that existed previously is re-established.

Re 2: How was the MERIT process perceived (Bayesian networks, citizens' meetings, workshops, citizens' group, newsletter, individual meetings, etc.)?

- 2.1 MERIT (Management of Environmental Resources using Integrated Techniques) seemed to us to be a politically determined project whose final desired result has been determined by political groups and "expert groups", and where the setting up of a citizens' group and other efforts were purely "for show".
- 2.2 It was interesting to make the acquaintance of Bayesian networks, although up until now the presentation of them has been very scanty in content. However, we do believe that they were very much used in the models for "Limits for growth

in 1969" and that they can be a good working tool in linking digital and analogue information.

2.3 Citizens' meeting There was one meeting with the mayor, in Sigerslevøster village hall. This seemed to us to be a "necessary" performance, like a course in a ready-made meal.

2.4 Workshops – we'll see on 3 March. There hasn't been any functioning workshop in the citizens' group.

2.5 Citizen's group. Yes, it was nice, but also highly frustrating because the meetings lacked structure and trailed off into a lot of local and personal problems in which the individual's poor chances against the authorities were very much emphasised. There were strong indications that the authorities consider themselves to be the citizens' masters rather than their servants. Sad, sad, sad.

2.6 Newsletter. It was an excellent idea, and the newsletter "*Frisk fra kilden*" ("Fresh from the source/spring") will surely make an attractive collectors' object because of its good intentions, short lifetime and low circulation.

2.7 Individual meetings, etc. we know nothing about, and don't know who attended them.

Re 3: How should stakeholders be involved in the future, e.g. should they be asked about active groundwater protection and whether wetlands should be established?

3.1 Before you consider whether to ask stakeholders for advice, you should **honestly** and **properly** make up your minds as to whether you will provide each citizen with the thoroughly prepared, correct and documented information they are entitled to instead of keeping all the information in closed groups, and should not send out irrevocable information on decisions after all decisions have been taken.

3.2 Right now there is no reason for the authorities to pretend to citizens and to themselves that they want to hear the citizens' opinions at all. Everything is decided above our heads, anyway, unless we revolt and stand together in action groups – something we have seen quite a bit of in connection with the establishing of wetlands that the authorities and Copenhagen Energy are pulling over the eyes of the closest residents near Havelse Creek.

The politicians and civil servants should be ashamed of themselves.

Re 4: Other comments on what happened

4.1 To put it mildly, we are extremely sceptical, since we are under the impression that individual citizens do not receive the information they are entitled to **before** the decisions are made.

We did not receive any seriously treated description of various alternatives and their consequences.

We were not considered well enough qualified to evaluate the information we were given, and the authorities considered it too difficult to have to work with and comply with a decision that finally ruled against "the mountain's" expectations and wishes.

- 4.2 It must really be clear to authorities (especially the municipality's Technical Services Department) and politicians in Frederikssund that the owners of and residents with properties adjacent to Havelse Creek do not want wetlands to be established, and they do not want all kinds of people – from Frederikssund, Copenhagen, etc. – wandering across their farmyards, fields and meadows.