

## Community Committee for Recycled Water Storage (Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme)

<b>Project Name</b>	Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme					
<b>Purpose</b>	Community Committee for Recycled Water Storage					
<b>Date</b>	11/05/2016		<b>Time</b>	5pm – 7pm		
<b>Meeting No.</b>	10		<b>Frequency</b>	Fortnightly		
<b>Facilitator</b>	Matthew Bonnett, SA Water		<b>Minute Taker</b>	Chloe Ringwood, SA Water		
<b>Venue</b>	Virginia Horticultural Centre, Old Port Wakefield Road, Virginia					
<b>Attendance</b>	Michael Picard	P	Eddie Stubing	P	Matthew Sheedy	P
Ab = Absent	Bryan Robertson	P	Kieren Chappell	P	Peter Rentoulis	P
Ap = Apologies	(proxy for Dino Musolino)					
P = Present	Ross Trimboli	P	Evie Arharidis	P	Louis Marafioti	P
	Mark Wilson	P	Megan Howard (proxy for Greg Pattinson)		Paul Cleghorn	P
	Felicia Nguyen	P	Nick Pezzaniti	P	Greg Pattinson	Ap
	Dino Musolino	Ap	Danny De Ieso	Ab	Nghien Nguyen	Ab
	Susie Green	Ab	Rocco Musolino	Ab		

### 1 Welcome and Apologies

Matt welcomed all members and introduced proxy's; Bryan Robertson and Megan Howard

The agenda for the meeting was outlined as follows:

1. Welcome and apologies
2. Minutes of previous meeting and review of actions
3. Workshop 4: Group discussion on the Draft Plan for Recycled Water Storage – Northern Adelaide Plains Region
4. Other business
5. Next meeting

The apologies were noted (as above).

### 2 Minutes of previous meeting and review of action items

The minutes of the previous meeting 13/04/16 were tabled to the Committee with a view to confirming them at the following meeting.

### 3 Workshop 4: Group discussion on the Draft Plan for Recycled Water Storage – Northern Adelaide Plains Region

*The questions received and responses provided are summarised as follows:*

A Committee member asked why a map of proposed storage locations has not been included in the plan in order to provide to the wider community. In response, it was noted that the location of the

storage will depend on what the chosen proponent has planned, which could be multiple locations. This document outlines the criteria identified by the Committee to lead the proponent to broad location(s) that align with these parameters. The Committee member added that they agree with the idea that information will help the proponent identify possible locations however disagree with the idea of taking this document to the wider community stating that the wider community are only interested in locations on a map.

*Matt asked the Committee to provide feedback on how this plan can be improved before sending out to the wider community.*

A Committee member asked if the purpose of the document could be expanded to outline how the document will be used. In response, it was noted that the purpose of this plan will need to be revised to be more descriptive on its intended use.

A Committee member questioned the information on salinity provided on pages 16-17 in the plan. The paragraph on page 16 states that 'no MAR should be constructed in an aquifer which has a salinity of less than 1200mg/L total dissolved solids (TDS) according to the EPA Water Quality Policy (2015)'. The Committee member added that there isn't a specified band for 1,200mg/L TDS in the map on page 17, only a light blue band which represents 1000 – 1500mg/L TDS. The plan should state that the dark and light blue sections on the map are essentially "no-go zones" and the green and yellow sections are possible areas for which a MAR could successfully occur. Matt added that some of the light blue sections could be considered for a MAR however, these may have further criteria based on the site selection process in these areas. It was acknowledged that this section needs to be more descriptive to remove the confusion.

A Committee member asked where Virginia is located on the map pictured on page 17 of the draft plan. In response, it was noted that this map was to be used as a guide only as it has been provided to SA Water by DEWNR. It was acknowledged that the map will be adjusted to include further detail such as towns and arterial roads.

A Committee member sought clarification on the purpose of this document and whether it is to be used by the proponents or the wider community. In response, it was noted that it was to be used for both. The Committee member suggested that there should be two documents (1 version for the community and 1 for the proponents). It was acknowledged that SA Water would need to accommodate for the different audience.

Several Committee members spoke of their concern naming the document a Master Plan as the term suggests that it should contain a far greater level of detail. It was suggested that the document be called 'Guidelines' or 'Considerations'. It was acknowledged that the name of the plan would need to be revised to reflect the purpose of the document.

Matt reminded the Committee that while it is acknowledged the plan needs to reflect a more digestible document for the community, care should be taken when dissecting the information to ensure the wider community can still understand how we got to this point.

A Committee member disagreed with the EPA's recommendations of using a MAR scheme in an aquifer of 1,200mg/L TDS and thought that the plan should recommend 1,500mg/L TDS and above. It was acknowledged that if the Committee are willing to endorse that then SA Water can create a map to reflect this area.

A Committee member spoke of previous discussions with a community member, located within the yellow band (2,000 – 7,000mg/L TDS), that uses bore water for bathing and questioned whether the community would agree with a scheme even in an area above 1500mg/L TDS. In response, it was noted that this is where the plan would need to specify some site specific consultation such as using the survey spoken of by another Committee member to determine the purpose of each bore in the area. A further question was asked about how SA Water will safeguard the public if a MAR scheme

was in close proximity to their domestic bore, such as providing mains water. A Committee member suggested considering committing to a power of veto. In response it was noted that these conditions could be stipulated as part of the site consultation and obtains Water could consider requiring land owner agreement of the proposed mitigation measures or MAR will not proceed in a low TDS area.

A Committee member reminded the Committee that the same criteria would not apply for above-ground storage and that there would be less concern if it were placed within the 1200-1300mg/L TDS zone. In response, it was acknowledged that above-ground storage is less sensitive; however there are a number of site specific issues such as visual amenity, environmental and safety to consider.

A Committee member asked if there could be a number of above-ground storages, rather than just one very large one. In response, it was noted that this is achievable and a possibility that the storage may end up being a combination of the two options. It's important to note that above-ground storages will have an impact on large amounts of land which could otherwise be utilised for food production.

A Committee member sought clarification of page 7 and page 8 of the plan regarding 'investing in additional treatment' and 'additional treatment processes if required'. In response, it was noted that if SA Water did not proceed with NAIS, SA Water would eventually need to improve the quality of the water to reduce the amount of Nitrogen discharged to the Gulf St Vincent to meet EPA requirements. It was added that SA Water can look to increase the level of treatment, however, it would impact on the cost to the end user and would need to be analysed fairly.

Matt took the opportunity to summarise the discussions to the Committee so far. These include;

- Review the title of the document (suggestion was Guidelines)
- Executive summary on key points
- Map with possible storage solutions and out of bounds areas
- Review the context of the document
- Summarise blocks of text in dot points

A Committee member asked if the document could include more detail around the water being 'fit for purpose'. In response, it was noted that it is important to include SA Water's overarching desire to improve the quality of the water to ensure it is 'fit for purpose'.

A Committee member sought clarification of SA Water's long term plan for potable water in the two Wells area. In response, it was noted that the existing network is not adequate to supply all of Hickenbothem's development and SA Water will need to work together with Council/Hickenbothem to ensure there is future supply. The Committee member also asked if the document could include more information around above-ground site selection to cover heritage and compliance issues and Council inclusion during a DAC approval. In response, it was noted that these were good suggestions and they would be included in the site selection process.

A Committee member suggested that there should be more indication around possible storage locations in the plan. In response, it was noted that this feedback will be included in the revised version, however it is important to note that specified storage locations will remain unknown until the chosen proponent is confirmed later this year.

A Committee member sought clarification of what ">100EP" referred to on page 24. In response, it was noted that EP stands for Equivalent Persons.

A Committee member sought clarification on page 13 where in the last paragraph of the document refers to 'immediately before distribution'. In response, it was noted that 'immediately' refers to the process in the pipeline system (right at the interface point before distribution) rather than in terms of time.

A Committee member suggested as with under-ground storage options, the plan could also include a map of possible 'no-go' areas for above-ground storage with reference to the water tables. In response, it was noted that this could be included in the plan, however important to note that it is difficult to assess this as the ground water is determined by the Quaternary aquifers which are very localised and there is very little information on this. It would be recommended that a Geotech would determine the soil sampling at that particular site and where the groundwater level was in relation to that.

A Committee member asked if the commitment to the community could include a bit more detail around how SA Water is going to engage with the community during site selection. In response, it was noted that this section will require more specific detail on engagement methods.

A Committee member asked if there was protection against storage options which may proceed without community and Council involvement. In response, it was noted that SA Water is committed to engaging with the community throughout this process and into the future (which involves Council). It was added that Council will also take on the responsibility and be proactive with the community to ensure elected members support the proposed scheme. It is important to note that SA Water will seek contractual measures with the proponents to ensure they follow these community recommendations and they're not going to sidestep SA Water or Council.

## 4 Other business

Matt asked the committee if there were any further questions or other business they wish to discuss.

No further questions were noted.

## 5 Next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for 8/06/2016 from 5-7pm at the Virginia Horticultural Centre.

SA Water will provide a revised version of the Storage Plan (Guidelines) to the Committee members prior to next meeting for review and comment. Any comments received will be reviewed for inclusion and provided to the Committee at the next meeting 8/6/16.

## Open Action Items Register

No.	Action	By Whom	Date Raised	Status
1.	Consider how an independent hydrogeological assessment of the technical modelling of any future managed aquifer storage schemes established as part of NAIS (in line with established Plan) could be undertaken and made publicly available.	SA Water	13/01/2016	Completed - included in storage plan
2.	To revise the Storage Plan (Guidelines) to be more prescriptive in certain areas of the document e.g. site selection process.	SA Water	11/05/2016	Completed - included in storage plan