

## 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>	8/06/2016		<b>Time</b>	5pm – 7pm		
<b>Meeting No.</b>	11		<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)	P	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 : Group discussion on the revised SA Water Guidelines for Recycled Water Storage in the Northern Adelaide Plains Region (Guidelines).
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 meetings 13/04/16 and 11/05/16 were tabled to the Committee for comment. No amendments were noted.

### 3 Workshop 5: Group discussion on revised SA Water Guidelines for Recycled Water Storage in the Northern Adelaide Plains

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

A Committee member asked how many proponents had been shortlisted in the EOI process. In response, it was noted that there are three proponents that have been shortlisted. It was added that the commonwealth government recently allocated \$2.5 million to conduct a feasibility study towards the benefits and costing of NAIS. The coalition also committed additional \$1.2m in funding for a feasibility study into establishing an irrigation industry in the Mid and Upper North regions of SA.

A Committee member asked whether State Government Funding was still available to apply for. In response, it was noted that additional funding sources were still available. There is potential for further funding from the Commonwealth for the construction stage however important to note that it's a long process before that application would be sought.

A Committee member sought clarification around the 'power of veto' statement in the Guidelines. In response, it was noted that the assessment would be made if a bore was in the water quality impact zone and would be independently peer reviewed. If the investigation determined that any bore was in the water quality impact zone, then the bore owner has the power to say no to the proposal.

A Committee member asked how the water quality impact zone is determined. In response, it was noted that it would depend on the aquifer characteristics at that particular site so there would be variances from site to site. Pump tests would determine this information.

A Committee member sought clarification on a statement in the Guidelines on page 10 which states that a MAR scheme could occur in areas where there are salinity levels less than 1500 mg/L total dissolvable solids (TDS). In response, it was noted that from a regulatory perspective, anyone is allowed to create a MAR scheme in areas of salinity under 1500 mg/L TDS. SA Water acknowledge that the community has concerns about a MAR under 1500 mg/L TDS and have included a set of additional criteria the proponent must meet. These include giving the bore owner a power of veto, ensuring drinking water is not adversely affected, localised site investigations to determine how long in years it would take to affect the water quality of nearby drinking water bores and independent peer review of groundwater models. It was added that while this map represents a solid line of 1500 mg/L TDS it is important to note that there are pockets within those bands where salinity differs in TDS. The characteristics of the aquifer would fluctuate across the blue coloured area and therefore would require further investigation.

A Committee member asked why the power of veto was only offered to bore owners in the water quality impact zone and not to the community within the vicinity of the area. In response, it was noted that the power of veto was included as a measure of good faith to bore owners in the Northern Adelaide Plains. Currently, if anyone wishes to create a MAR scheme above 1200 mg/L TDS there are minimal community consultation requirements from a regulatory perspective.

A Committee member asked if the criteria in the guidelines was changed to utilise the existing pipeline. In response, it was noted that by focusing on the Northern Adelaide Plains area surrounding the existing Virginia Pipeline Scheme would ensure NAIS can remain economically viable and reduce costs passed on to the end user.

A Committee member sought clarification about where the prescribed zone is located. In response, it was noted that a map of the prescribed wells zone in the Northern Adelaide Plains is available on DEWNR's [Waterconnect website](#) and is slightly north of Two Wells.

A Committee member asked why water cannot be stored in groundwater with salinity levels above 3000 mg/L TDS. In response, it was noted that water can be stored underground in salinity levels above 3000 mg/L TDS, however less water of a suitable quality can be recovered because the injected water on the outer edges of the plume mixes with the local groundwater and becomes too saline. The higher the salinity of the groundwater the lower the recovery efficiency, which decreases the viability of the scheme.

A Committee member asked if SA Water could use the data obtained from recent Hatcher Road, Kangaroo Flat investigations to assist with NAIS. In response, it was noted that there is no obligation for the organisation responsible for the investigation to share their results with SA Water.

A Committee member asked why there isn't a 1000 mg/L TDS line on the map in the Guidelines. In response, it was noted that the data has been provided to us by DEWNR and did not contain data for 1000 mg/L TDS. It can be obtained from a number of obs wells however it would take time to gather the information. This map represents approximate areas for further investigation of below-ground storage in the NAP.

A Committee member asked if SA Water have preferred locations for underground storage within the green zone (1500-3000mg/L TDS). In response, it was noted that there is not any preferred locations, however the proponent would be unwise to propose an underground storage in very close proximity to any of the bores on this map.

A Committee member asked if the proponent would need to spend large amounts of money drilling pilot wells to assess the salinity. In response, it was noted that the risk is if they're in the blue zone, they're potentially wasting time and money. If the drilling occurs in the green zone then the proponent has a better chance of achieving a successful outcome.

A Committee member asked what their involvement will be after the Guidelines are released for wider consultation. In response, it was noted that SA Water would like to reconvene with the Committee after the successful proponent for NAIS is announced. SA Water would like to propose that the Committee meet again once that proponent has identified a potential area for storage. It would be recommended that the Committee meet with SA Water annually to work through any potential concerns/issues that may arise.

A Committee member suggested the fourth dot point on page 17 should state "a" 100 year floodplain rather than "in the 100 year floodplain" or "in a flood prone area". In response, it was noted that this will be corected in the Guidleines.

A Committee member suggested that the wording on page 19 needs to include "organic and heavy metals" in addition to inorganic chemicals.

A Committee member asked if the second dot point on page 18 about "maintaining the viability of existing growers through pricing and exploring new markets" could be expanded. The member spoke of the difficulties local growers experience with local markets already being flooded with produce and thinks the extra water to the region will only bring further competition. In response, it was noted that the Government support for increasing export for fresh produce is paramount for the success of NAIS. SA Water are aware of these concerns from the community of the NAP and this feedback has been provided to the proponents of NAIS. The economic justification from the Commonwealth for seeking feasibility of the scheme is underpinned by the assumption for export markets. A heavily weighted section in the EOI process includes key evaluation criteria where proponents must demonstrate clear connection to export markets.

A Committee member suggested that the Guidelines may need to include the point about organic growers unable to use the recycled water on their produce. In response, it was noted that this was a good suggestion and something that would need to be considered during the site selection process when determining the use of bores in the vicinity of potential underground storage.

A Committee member suggested some additional wording on page 6 of the Guidelines to include ongoing community engagement to communicate changing project outcomes and changes in community's expectations.

A Committee member suggested the Guildelines include further detail around approvals from Council, land use (i.e. heritage, zoning etc.) and Council support with the consultation process.

SA Water staff handed out soils map of the NAP to the Committee to review for potential above-ground storage. Committee concerns and suggestions from the activity are outlined below.

A Committee member raised concern for any above-ground storage to occur on the valuable land in and surrounding Virginia.

A Committee member suggested that any area which floods in NAP would obviously need to be avoided as well.

A Committee member suggested that anything coloured yellow or green should be avoided. The areas labelled as 5 and 6 were noted as potential sites for above-ground storage. Areas 1, 2 and 3 definitely no-go zones however 4 could have potential due to the clay soil.

A Committee member mentioned that there is an old loam pit on Gawler River Road, Lewiston which covers about 40 acres which could be used for storage.

## 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

Matt asked the Committee if they were comfortable for the Guidelines to be released for wider consultation once the additional changes discussed in this meeting had been made rather than reconvening for another meeting. In response, it was noted that some Committee members were uncomfortable with some of the criteria however agreed that it is a risk that SA Water need to own. Matt agreed that SA Water will need to make some decisions on whether the Guidelines are released for wider consultation without having full Committee support.

Matt asked the Committee if they are comfortable with the following statement in the Guidelines:

*'The Committee agrees that the "Draft SA Water Guidelines for Recycled Water Storage in the Northern Adelaide Plains" takes in to account many community concerns, incorporates feedback from consultation to date and is suitable for release as a draft document for the next step in broader consultation.'*

Committee agreed to the above statement and asked that the group reconvenes once the proponent is announced and again once a potential location is identified for storage. In response, it was noted that SA Water would arrange to meet with the Committee as the project develops and perhaps on an annual basis.

## Open Action Items Register

No.	Action	By Whom	Date Raised	Status
1.	Committee feedback to be reviewed for inclusion in Guidelines	SA Water	08/06/2016	Complete
2.	Send Guidelines to bore owners	SA Water	08/06/2016	Underway