

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 19 21 July 2020 – LCLB Office Keith

Group Attendees- Kerry DeGaris (Group chair) – Limestone Coast Landscapes Board, David Edwards – Mundulla Vignerons Inc, Michelle Irvine – SA Water, , Robert Mock – District Council Tatiara, Scott Campbell – Lucerne Australia (left at 6:22pm), Wayne Dodd – USE NRM Group.

Apology- Paul Leadbeter – Conservation Council SA, Richard Halliday – Livestock SA, Scott Manser Lucerne Australia,

Staff and Department Attendees- Phil Elson (PE) – Senior Project Officer Water Planning LCLB, Sue Botting – Team Leader Water Policy and Planning LCLB, Dean Zeven – Project Officer Water Licensing DEW, Cameron Wood – Senior Hydrogeologist DEW (via phone 5:15pm – 6:30 pm).

Item	Notes
Welcome	Kerry DeGaris welcomed attendees.
Previous meeting notes	<p>Minutes Previous minutes from meeting 18 confirmed as true and correct.</p> <p>Action outcomes to note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 17.1 – Completed to be removed. • Action 17.3 – Completed to be removed. • Action 18.4 – Completed to be removed. • Action 18.5 – Completed to be removed. <p>Outstanding action list items noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 1.14 – Unbundling not on agenda due priority to discuss Poocher Management Zone. • Action 18.1 – On agenda for discussion. • Action 18.2 – On agenda for discussion. • Action 18.3 – On agenda for discussion. <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil <p>Advisory Group member Tasks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task 6.1 – On agenda for discussion.
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 MI reported that Glyn Ashman has retired from SA Water. Michelle will replace Glyn as SA Water’s primary representative and SA Water will advise if a replacement proxy will be nominated.

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 19 21 July 2020 – LCLB Office Keith

Item	Notes
Poocher Management Zone	<p>Discussion on Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on information and criteria around Poocher management zone received from RM and MI. • Can the modelling be improved? The current model is sufficient for particle tracking and informing the Management Zone boundary. This meets primary needs of the WAP. • MI: Is it possible to undertake scenario modelling for the next ten years? • Limitations on time, resources and capacity of model. Improvements may be possible (need to update and project out to the future) but unlikely to meet WAP review timeframes. • Improved model may inform impacts of on-going extraction when no recharge, linking level of extraction to size of freshwater lens, and help determine appropriate RCTs. • MI: What is the option for increasing the level of security to protect the town water supply? In SA this currently only occurs on the River Murray. There has been some discussions with DEW but no further progress at present. • RM presented nine points re the Bordertown water supply. MI responded that these were standard issues managed by SA Water across the state and managing those issues is cheaper than a new pipeline. SA Water’s approach is to manage water locally. <p>Zone boundary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group requested further explanation of differences between a consumptive pool and management zone. • PE explained that in a consumptive pool an adaptive management response (when RCTs / RCLs are triggered) would apply to everyone’s allocation, reducing overall extraction. In a management zone, which is part of a larger consumptive pool, the adaptive management response could apply to the water resource works approvals within the zone, limiting extraction from that particular area. Licensees within the zone would still be able to use their full allocation outside of the zone, in the larger consumptive pool, or trade it to any consumptive pool outside the management zone. • Decision: Group agreed to use a management zone, rather than consumptive pool, to protect Bordertown’s water supply. • PE explained the rationale for the proposed boundary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 particle tracking used to identify bores drawing water from within 1000mg/L area. (Why not other data – 2015 tracking shows that some bores that used to draw water from inside 1000mg/L don’t anymore). • Then drew boundary around cadastral parcels where a bore was drawing from the lens. • DE: Should the bottom of Poocher swamp be included? PE: Cadastral parcel is quite substantial and extends up and around the eastern side of Poocher. • RM: Should the zone be made larger to protect the resource - be more precautionary and bank water for the future? • Currently there is a strong rationale based on modelling to define the zone, any change from that would need to be underpinned by a similar level of explanation.

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 19 21 July 2020 – LCLB Office Keith

Item	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RM question to WD: How will the management zone boundary be explained to the community? WD: It will be difficult but the rationale is reasonable. There will be community resistance particularly due to the weird shape of the boundary. • DE: Vineyard boundary on shaded map is not correct. • Group noted that improved data and modelling may be available in the future to allow for a review of the management zone boundary. • Decision: Group accepted the proposed zone boundary, subject to any correction of vineyard location (Action 19.1), with an option to review at 5 years. <p>ACTION 19.1: PE to check and amend Poocher management zone boundary w.r.t vineyard boundary if needed.</p> <p>RCTs – types, values and actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PE: RCTs will only apply to the management zone, not entire consumptive pool. • Adaptive management response will be a restriction on extraction from within the zone, not on allocation. • RCTs / RCL to be of a similar format to those for the consumptive pools, eg. Trigger Value Exceedance Condition = 25% of spring observations exceed the RCT. • Proposed RCT of 50% restriction on extraction if 25% of observations exceed the RCT. • For what period would the RCT triggered reductions apply – the life of the plan? • What if it doesn't rain for ten years, is 50% reduction sufficient to retain critical water supplies? • CW: Level and period of reductions could be tested. Climate changes need to be considered. Multiple scenarios could be run. Need to be comfortable with assumptions used in the modelling. • RM: How to manage the resource following adaptive management to ensure that licensees outside the management zone, but able to access freshwater lens when it is recovered, don't draw down the resource and re-trigger an RCT, putting those inside the zone back into restrictions? • PE: Advise including a 5 year review of the Poocher management zone adaptive management framework in the WAP. <p>Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PE: The issue being managed is salinity so it would be appropriate to use salinity for setting RCTs and RCL. • Some direction needed on which wells to monitor –outer wells or SA Water wells. General preference to use both – but need to know if this is doable and informative. Is there a predictive relationship between salinity levels in the outer wells and SA Water wells– what is the risk of getting it wrong? <p>ACTION 19.2: PE to investigate RCT monitoring options for Poocher.</p> <p>Task 19.1 MI to consult SA Water hydrogeologist as to what monitoring would be more useful for SA Water.</p>
Community Engagement and consultation	<p>Community engagement and consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PE: Draft communication plan has been updated to reference the Limestone Coast Landscape Board and circulated for comment.

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 19 21 July 2020 – LCLB Office Keith

Item	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested to work up some case studies (5-7) as examples and use these to explain concepts rather than focussing on explaining what unbundling is. • Need to engage with recreational licensees and educate them on licence rules as person responsible often changes. <p>Task 19.2 Group to provide feedback and comments on draft community engagement plan.</p>
Classes of entitlements/allocations	<p>Update on proposed classes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PE: Proposed classes of T (tradable), D (delivery supplement) and S (special production requirement). This replicates the current structure in the unbundled environment. • Should Delivery Supplement and SPR be removed? • PE: Investigated this but found that the volumes of SPR allocations involved were significant. • If certain trades occur DS and SPR will be surrendered and there will be a natural attrition that gradually reduces them. • Decision: Group agreed to three proposed classes.
Recreational water use	<p>Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PE: Investigated recreational water use sites that are also bushfire last resort refuges – there was 13 but there is now an additional two. • Western Flat is not a designated bushfire last resort refuge. • Western Flat exceeded its licence 2-3 years ago, not recently. • Group agreed that the issue of seeking a Section 105 exemption for water for bushfire last resort sites should be raised as part of consultation.
Summary of Discussion – Next Steps	<p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next meeting: 18th August 2020 5pm to 7:30pm at Keith LCLB Office
Meeting Close	7:44 pm

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 19 21 July 2020 – LCLB 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
1.14	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	Instruments to be used and how they would be used to be presented at next meeting
18.1	PE to put on agenda for next meeting - discussion on recreational water use sites that are also bushfire last resort refuges and allowing for a certain amount of water to be exempt from requiring an allocation.	On agenda	Issue to be raised as part of community consultation.
18.2	PE to put on agenda for next meeting – discussion on engagement with recreational water users/ sports grounds/ schools around their requirements of water use and the rules under the WAP.	On agenda	To be included as an action in the WAP engagement plan
18.3	PE & MM to come up with a draft communications engagement action plan or group to review.	Two draft plans developed	
19.1	PE to check and amend Poocher management zone boundary w.r.t vineyard boundary if needed.		
19.2	PE to investigate RCT monitoring options for Poocher.		

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 19 21 July 2020 – LCLB 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.	Approved
16.1	That the resignation of Trent Reilly (Mundulla Vignerons) as observer be accepted. That the SAG decision to not replace this position be accepted.	

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Summary Meeting 19 21 July 2020 – LCLB Office Keith

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group
Members Task Table

Task No.	Task	Status	Outcome
6.1 Check this task no	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	In development
18.1	Group to provide feedback and comments on management zone to protect town's water resource.	Two feedback replies received	Feedback used in discussion at meeting 19
18.2	Group to provide comment on proposed entitlement/allocation classes	One feedback reply received	Decision made at meeting 19 to have three classes as proposed.
19.1	MI to consult SA Water hydrogeologist as to what monitoring would be more useful for SA Water.		
19.2	Group to provide feedback and comments on draft community engagement plan.		