

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 14 3 July 2019 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Group Attendees-Kerry DeGaris (Group chair) - SENRM Board, Scott Manser - Lucerne Australia, Robert Mock – District Council Tatiara, David Edwards – Mundulla Vignerons Inc, Glyn Ashman – SA Water.

Apology- Paul Leadbeter – Conservation Council, Trent Reilly – Mundulla Vignerons Inc, Wayne Dodd – Community Rep, Scott Campbell – Lucerne Australia.

Staff Attendees- Cameron Wood (CW) – Senior Hydrogeologist DEW, Dean Zeven – Project Officer Water Licensing SE, Phil Elson (PE) – Senior Project Officer Water Planning NRSE, Daniela Conesa – Acting Team Leader Water Planning NRSE (minutes).

Item	Notes
Welcome	Kerry DeGaris welcomed attendees.
Previous meeting notes	<p>Minutes Previous minutes from meeting 13 confirmed as true and correct.</p> <p>Action outcomes to note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 11.1 – Completed to be removed. • Action 11.2 – Completed to be removed. • Action 11.3 – Completed to be removed. <p>Outstanding action list items noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 1.13 – Still awaiting information from PIRSA. • Action 7.3 – Reports that have been approved to be circulated to group. • Action 8.2 –Further assessment to be developed as required. <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation 13.1 – Michelle Irvine’s appointment as SA Water observer to the group approved by the Board. <p>Advisory Group member Tasks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task 6.1 - ongoing • Task 13.1 – Completed at meeting.
Ground rules	No points were raised by members in relation to the Ground Rules
Group charter	No points were raised by members in relation to the Group Charter

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 14 3 July 2019 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Item	Notes
Risk Assessment	<p>Confidence Rating Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scored by panel for data information and group knowledge done during risk assessment. Agreement with results is also high. • All confidence scores are moderate (below 8) or high. No low confidence scores. • Low or medium risk with moderate confidence: actions is to try and monitor the risk – need to build this into WAP if possible. Will help inform the next risk assessment. • The Tatiara WAP proposed to include RCLs and RCTs, so wouldn't need to specify in WAP when risk assessment needs to be re-run. • WAP needs to include actions linked to RCTs – hitting a trigger would be an indicator that a risk has increased. • No high risks have arisen from risk assessment
Discussion Papers	<p>Confirm changes to Landscape and Monitoring discussion papers from last meeting</p> <p>Landscape discussion paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P1, paragraph 5, last sentence: Delete 'and also flows in the wetlands'. Priority for Poocher and Mundulla was surface water recharge. • Endorsed with the change above <p>Monitoring discussion paper (now titled resource condition limits and monitoring)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring review done by Roger Cranswick • Endorsed with no further changes <p>Review of draft discussion papers Site Extraction/Use, Entitlements/Allocations and Overarching Issues</p> <p>Site extraction and use discussion paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seasonal transfers added to paper • Endorsed with no further changes • Developing a new hydrogeological methodology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hotspots software is an option ○ Alternative approach developed by Roger Cranswick based on Thiess equation ○ Need to be compared with current test ○ Cameron Wood's group might be able to develop ○ Paper refers to not creating areas of high demand – change to 'creating further areas of high demand or intensifying existing areas' ○ Technical report concludes no aquatic GDEs present. Refers to terrestrial (e.g. Red gums). Needs a definition.

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 14 3 July 2019 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Item	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Page 9: water management options include using an equation to limit extraction. Guiding principles developed refer to encouraging ... and recognising efficiency. Viticulture has reduced extraction to 1/3. The equation is presented as an option – up to SAG to consider/not consider. However, seems to contradict guiding principles. Also need to try to maintain that fresher groundwater lens. Might consider measures that don't affect existing use, but preclude further expansion of irrigation. Amend to say 'equation to manage to extraction'. Don't make measures retroactive. ● Temporary transfers – states unbundling will free up transfers. Maybe write as “may help”. ● WRWA can now have multiple wells on it, so allocation applies to all of the wells, but does not specify how much from each well, e.g. 100 ML allocation with 5 bores with extraction limit of 80 ML each – you can pump as much as 80 ML from any of them, but cannot exceed 100 ML in total. ● Currently a property that is divided by 16 km² circle, is assessed as using the proportional amount of the allocation within the circle – will be better with WRWA that specifies how much can be taken from each well, rather than a proportion of the allocation. ● An irrigator scaling back on operation can have 1000 ML allocation, but WRWA for 50 ML. The rest of the water can be traded or leased to others – you can hold more water than you can use on your property. ● You can buy allocation without hydrogeological assessment – the hydrogeological assessment is required in order to acquire a WRWA and be able to extract the water. ● In new WAP might need to say that a WRWA is cancelled or adjusted, if the allocation is permanently sold. Otherwise you create a “shadow” which keeps others from acquiring WRWA. ● Under 9, third dot point, delete from 'or to use the confined aquifer'. ● Page 9 delete next steps number 3. ● Page 9 Next steps 2. Requires that salinity needs to be identified as an issue in the paper. ● Delete 'confined aquifer may provide an alternative' in second row of page 9. ● Top of page 8 – protection zone could potentially be a separate management area. <p>Entitlements and allocation discussion paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assumption made about unbundling and consumptive pool. Changes to consumptive pool would change entitlements – allocations are based on the entitlement and can be varied every year. Change 'will' to 'would'. ● Page 2. Next steps should include developing types of RCTs and RCLs (e.g. hydraulic gradient, depth to water, salinity) and the scale (management area, hydrogeological zones, confined vs unconfined aquifers). ● Under 5. How is delivery supplement going to work? Permanent in the LLC. ● Page 6, 2nd management option – clarify it's about the definition (make it as per definition in the LLC WAP). ● Page 5: desired outcomes has a lot more meaning than next steps – cut and paste into next steps on page 2. ● Page 4. Water management options: say 'boundary(ies)'

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 14 3 July 2019 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Item	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure management area boundaries go around CT boundaries where possible. • Discussion paper doesn't include current recommendations about boundaries. Update as much as possible, e.g. SAG recognises there are two distinct hydrogeological zones. • Temporary transfers: also need to refer to the two types of temporary transfer, subject to hydro and not (seasonal). • Endorsed subject to changes above <p>Overarching issues discussion paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seems to be intro to unbundling – use this to introduce unbundling in the other papers • Consider numbering papers and make this Number 1 • Update as much as needed, given there is now an unbundled plan ready for consultation in another region • Do not need a SUA if the WAP doesn't say you need. Current options are to also not need a WRWA if WAP does not require it. • Next steps: make 1. Develop the unbundled systems and 2. Consider how it works. • Highlight 3 existing guiding principles. • Endorsed subject to changes above <p>Additional discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final discussion papers to go to the Board for approval for putting on the website. • Concern from SAG member about delays in developing policy options – have been meeting for 2 years. Would like to go to the community with options recommended by the SAG. • Concern discussion papers are a repeat of original issues paper. • Reports from DEW Science haven't been released until very recently, so weren't available publically. <p>Action 14.1 – PE to make changes to discussion papers as listed above. Recommendation 14.1 – Final endorsed drafts of all 6 discussion papers be forwarded to Board for approval to release.</p>
Resource Condition Limits & Resource Condition Triggers	<p>Cameron Wood gave an overview of recommendations developed to date for RCLs</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitability: are the ones developed so far appropriate? • Should we track extraction as a trigger? • If 100% allocation extraction is unsustainable, should we allow it to continue? We might need to set triggers based on extraction. • Plains and Highlands need different RCTs and RCLs. • One option to collect salinity data is to use citizen science • RCTs and RCLs for public water supply and vines would be salinity

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 14 3 July 2019 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Item	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other crops would set RCLTs and RCLs based on volumes. • AGREED: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ will use RCLs and RCTs in the WAP as a way to determine management actions ○ Use water levels in the Lowlands ○ Use hydraulic gradient for the Lowlands ○ Use water levels in the Highlands in order to protect stock and domestic wells – but values can be different than in Lowlands ○ Hydraulic gradient probably not relevant to Highlands ○ Use salinity for both areas based on the requirements of the land use. ○ Use levels of extraction in both areas as a RCT ○ Scale for applying RCTs and RCLs: no need to think in same terms as risk assessment. Might need to look at land use as well. Maybe use 3 zones???? ○ Shaugh is the most limited for monitoring data. ○ Need salinity trigger for town water supply zone. Might need to be for surface water recharge, but would trigger something in the WAP, if it is the cause of the increase in salinity. • Actual values for RCLs and RCTs to come through discussion and policy options. Can also involve industry groups. <p>Action 14.2 – CW to circulate condition of the resource report to the group.</p> <p>Action 14.3 – CW and PE to update last slide of presentation (draft proposed RCLs and RCTs table) and circulate to the group.</p>
Summary of Discussion – Next Steps	<p>Next steps: Cameron to present updated RCTs and RCLs at next meeting Next meeting: 1 August (postponed)</p>
Meeting Close	8:00pm

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 14 3 July 2019 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Action Table

Action	Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group Actions	Status	Outcome
1.2	Positions for Onion and Potato Grower Organisations be held open for members if they are able to become involved as the planning process develops.	Ongoing	Organisations may be represented at any stage of review
1.4	Build in engagement of JBS into the Community Engagement Strategy	Engagement with JBS has been established	Ongoing
1.7	Set Ground Rules and the Charter as a standing meeting agenda item.	Ongoing	Remain open for discussion & review
1.13	Impacts of clay spreading / delving requires greater understanding – Naracoorte ranges report to be located and communicated to the group	Action to be closed once report is circulated.	Still awaiting reports.
1.14	Work on consumptive pools and unbundling will need to be scheduled into the groups work plan / forward agenda programme	On hold pending further advice on Landscapes Act unbundling provisions	Unbundling has been suspended by the Board
6.2	Staff to bring back some potential examples of unbundling and consumptive pool/s to help the group gain better understanding.	On hold	
7.3	Staff to circulate modelling report to group	Awaiting approval for release	
8.2	Staff to report back to group on the socio-economic assessment workshop.	Workshop was cancelled.	Further assessment to be developed and undertaken as required.
14.1	PE to make changes to discussion papers as discussed at meeting.		
14.2	CW to circulate condition of the resource report to the group.		
14.3	CW and PE to update last slide of presentation (draft proposed RCLs and RCTs table) and circulate to the group.		

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 14 3 July 2019 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Recommendation Table

No.	Recommendation	Board Decision
6.1	That the nominations by Mundulla Vignerons Assoc. of David Edwards as member representative and Trent Reilly as observer representative be accepted and approved.	Approved
6.2	That the resignation of David Edwards as observer representative for the District Council of Tatiara be accepted.	Approved
6.3	That the District Council of Tatiara be contacted seeking a nomination for an observer representative to replace David Edwards.	Approved
6.4	That upon the disbandment of the USE NRM Group in February 2018 that the SAG charter be amended by the removal of the USE Group from the stakeholder membership list and that a community stakeholder representative membership position be added to the SAG charter.	Approved
6.5	That upon the disbandment of the USE NRM Group, Wayne Dodd be reappointed to the SAG as the community stakeholder representative member on the SAG.	Approved
6.6	That the final draft version of the principles as endorsed by the SAG be submitted to the Board for approval.	Approved
8.1	That the revised timeline for the Tatiara WAP review be submitted to the Board for endorsement.	Approved
8.2	That the group chair send a letter to the NRM board recommending that the Board provide comment to the Landscapes SA Bill public consultation on unbundling.	Approved
11.1	The amended group charter endorsed by the SAG to be submitted to the Board for approval.	Approved
12.1	The revised Tatiara WAP review and amendment timeline be submitted to the Board for approval.	Approved
13.1	That Michelle Irvine nomination to the group as observer representing SA Water be forwarded to the Board for approval.	Approved
14.1	Final endorsed drafts of all 6 discussion papers be forwarded to Board for approval to release.	

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Members Task Table

Task No.	Task	Status	Outcome
6.1	Members to consider the instruments outlined and potential areas of consumptive pool/s. Consider the provisions that the WAP needs to be built on e.g. enhancing trade, management of hot spots etc.	Ongoing	

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 14 3 July 2019 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

10.2	The group to consider what spatial and time scales they prefer to be used in the risk assessment	Group to provide feedback by next meeting	Completed
12.1	Group to review the consequence criteria already circulated through email and provide comments and feedback. The criteria will be further discussed and finalized during the workshop	Completed at 1 st risk workshop	Completed
13.1	The group to review the Site Extraction/Use discussion papers and forward any comments to PE.		Completed