Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group

Summary Meeting 7 22 February 2018 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Group Attendees-Kerry DeGaris (Group chair proxy and member SENRM Board), Scott Manser - Lucerne Australia, Glyn Ashman – SA Water, Wayne Dodd – USE NRM Group, Scott Campbell – Lucerne Australia, Richard Monk – District Council Tatiara, David Edwards – Mundulla Vignerons Inc.

Apology- Jodie Carey - SA Water, Paul Leadbeter – Conservation Council, Richard Halliday – Livestock SA, Trent Reilly – Mundulla Vignerons Inc.

Staff Attendees-Phil Elson (PE) - Senior Planning Officer NRSE, Jennifer Schilling (JS) - Team Leader Water Policy and Planning NRSE, David Williamson - Team Leader Water & Fauna Permits DEWNR

Item	Notes
Welcome	Kerry DeGaris welcomed attendees
Previous meeting notes	**Action outcomes to note** • CSIRO salinity report presented, David Edwards to check if he has a copy of the executive summary. • Draft guiding principles for WAP revision endorsed by Board. • DEWNR working group raised the inclusion of more specific principles on providing certainty of entitlement into guiding principles. **Outstanding action list items noted** • Actions 1.12, 2.4, 4.1 & 6.1 completed. **Recommendations** • Recommendations 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 & 6.6 were presented to the December Board meeting and approved. Note that Tatiara District Council did not nominate a replacement observer. **Advisory Group member Tasks** • Task 6.1 ongoing
Ground rules	No points were raised by members in relation to the Ground Rules
Group charter	JS reported the outcome of the consideration of the SAG recommendations that were put to the SENRM Board at their December meeting. The SE NRM Board approved the proposed changes to SAG membership • David Edwards resignation as observer for the District Council of Tatiara accepted. • David Edwards appointed as representative for Mundulla Vignerons Inc. as replacement for Jeff Flint. • Trent Reilly appointed as observer for Mundulla Vignerons Inc. The SE NRM Board approved the changes to the SAG ToR which included the removal the USE NRM Group from the stakeholder list and the appointment of Wayne Dodd as community representative following the disbandment of the NRM Group.
Draft timeline for plan preparation	JS provided hard copy of revised draft timeline (minutes attachment 1) • Timeline extended to June 2020 – re drafting of the timeline has been pushed out to enable a longer period to define how unbundling could work for a groundwater system and the communication of any changes to stakeholders • It was highlighted that a key challenges for the process is defining how unbundling arrangements can be implemented.

Item	Notes
	• JS highlighted a series of tasks that will need to be completed prior to the commencement of drafting – risk assessment methodology, review of management boundaries, defining an confirming resource condition limits (RCLs) and running 2 further groundwater modelling scenarios, socio economic assessment and risk assessment implementation. Risk Assessment scheduled for early in 2018/2019 the assessment needs to: o Be transparent o Identify hazards and what might cause them o Look at pathways of risk and control available o Consider what level of risk is tolerable Socio-economic assessment to consider aspects such as: • Impacts of policy changes • Impacts on the value of production and wider community impacts associated with resource condition and policy Noted that socio-economic information is needed for a balanced approach to the risk assessment The revised timeline includes • 1st draft WAP ready for consultation in early 2019 – SAG identified the best time for consultation possibly May/June • Formal consultation draft WAP ready for consultation around August 2019 • Final draft WAP ready for adoption by Minister around March 2020 • Level of change associated with the introduction of unbundling represents a change from current operations and may require more time than allocated. Note – there is also a substantial regional water planning workload required during the Tatiara WAP review **Action 7.1** – JS to bring back revised timeline for group endorsement.
Update on Unbundling	PowerPoint presentation – Phil Elson Phil summarised components of unbundling including: Water Allocations • Volume can be varied from year to year • Different classes of allocations can be used Water Resource Works Approvals • Must be used for allocated water • Not required for stock & domestic unless WAP requires • Can set a cap on the volume of water taken from a site Site Use Approvals • Must be used for allocated water unless WAP exempts • Not required for stock & domestic unless WAP requires it Consumptive Pools

Item	Notes
	• Two or more consumptive pools may be established in the same part of a water resource and be assigned particular purposes • Defining a consumptive pool by volume should be avoided • Preferred approach is to define consumptive pools by physical or geographical features or by a formulaic process
Hydrological zones & resource condition limits	Introduction –JS identified that the key issues from the review document to be addressed at the meeting included: **t) Resource condition triggers and the concept of Resource Condition Limits** **u) Management Area Boundaries including consideration of** hydrogeological based management areas **w) Unbundling (separation of water rights into different instruments)** Session aims: • to explore options for matching management areas to hydrological zones – characteristics • to seek some initial consensus on resource condition limits (RCLs) • to identify two extra modelling scenarios It was highlighted that the definition of management zones, RCLs, and groundwater modelling was focussed on determining acceptable extraction limits within a risk assessment framework. SAG member identified the following points in relation to a discussion of the purpose of management zones: • Setting management zones allows the plan take into account different capabilities of the aquifer for extraction without harm • Can enable the WAP to define different production/industry areas – soil types • Can enable the WAP to consider different salinity levels • Management Boundaries can limit trade and in-effect sets the water value • Policy certainty- Management areas identified in a WAP provides transparency around where policies apply Discussion on the issue of management boundaries highlighted that if a change was to be considered it would be big step to take (in terms of stakeholder understanding) in the content of the change that would result to licenses associated with having to unbundling licenses as well. It was highlighted that the group would need to consider this issue when examining the boundary issue. PowerPoint Presentation – Roger Cranswick Roger provided a recap on the properties of the unconfined aquifer including hydrogeology, salinity, recharge & current extractions: • PWA has two distinct hydrogeological zone – highlands to the east and coastal flats to the west • Water flows east to west with depth to groundwater relative deep in the east of the PWA and shallower in the west • Groundwater level Trends in the highlands fairly stable, transition zone a slight decline, coastal flats declining trend • Salinity in highlands no change, coastal flats has an increasing salinity trend primarily due to irrigation recycling

Item	Notes
	The Group Discussion on if a hydrogeological approach was to be used for setting management areas the following resource parameters could be used: • Depth to water • salinity contours – salinity is influenced by diffused and point recharge particularly in the coastal flats – boundaries shift • Fresh water lens could be management area – e.g. Poocher Discussed the potential for fuzzy boundaries mark boundaries to be used if the boundary was arbitrary Other drivers to set boundaries – were identified as management objectives, adaptive management, sustainability Key points highlighted in discussion of the potential for management boundaries based on hydrological features included: • highlands and coastal plains are distinct areas • Consideration required of having different resource condition limits (RCLs) e.g in Wirrega different RCLs may not be fair • The boundary between the highlands and the coastal plain has been assessed as being hundreds of metres not kilometres • Detail of drawing a boundary line into policy needs to be considered – follow cadastral? • Boundaries need to be pragmatic – got to make it simple – • **Action 7.2** – JS & PE to review boundary options and bring back some alternatives to the group based on the discussion. Discussion on RCLs: • RCL approach aims to keep resource within agreed limits - setting limit is critical to managing resource • Should be specific to area, measurable, include the establishment of triggers, developed through community engagement • Need to generalise RCLs to be applicable within each area – financial implications what decline is tolerable and what is unacceptable within what timeframe. • Need a reference point then think what future decline the community is willing to accept • Setting triggers for response actions along the way to the unacceptable RCL is important- potential to establish 1 to 3 warning/trigger points on way to intolerable RCL. Response actions to be activated when a trigger is reached need to be effective and make a difference • Use modelling to predict if RCLs will be met under different conditions • What parameter is likely to shut down an enterprise first then use that information in modelling and setting limits based on that • Groundwater reacts quite slow to management actions and affects livelihoods • Need to find what is a sensible limit – What development potential is there? • Need info on when stock and domestic wells would need to be deepened. • Need to look at modelling outputs that have already been completed before making decision on setting RCLs.

Item	Notes
	Action 7.3 – RC to circulate modelling report Members agreed on the following additional modelling: 1) Mallee highland expansion – additional 50 GL (ie on top of the existing use) of the from new extraction wells distributed across the mallee highland while all existing wells are maintained at the recent average extraction rates 2) Mallee highland super-expansion – additional 80 GL (ie on top of the existing use) from new extraction wells distributed across the mallee highlands with increasing intensity towards the north and east, in addition to recent average extraction rates by existing users. • RCL value to test in coastal plain 3m decline in water level over 10 years • RCL value to test in highlands 5m decline in water level over 10 years **Action 7.4** – RC to undertake modelling of scenarios 1) additional 50 GL of extraction in highland AND (2) additional 80 GL of extraction in the highland against RCL values of 3m/10yr decline coastal flats and 5m/10yr decline highlands.
Summary of Discussion – Next Steps	Proposal to have longer meetings when needed agreed to my members. Next meeting 12 April 2018 NRSE Keith Office – 5.00pm – 7.30pm.
Meeting Close	8.20pm

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group

Summary Meeting 7 22 February 2018 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

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	JBS to be contacted along with other confined users	Ongoing
1.7	Set Ground Rules and the Charter as a standing meeting agenda item.	ongoing	Remain open for discussion & review
1.9	Roger Cranswick to locate the study that examined the transition line between the Mallee Highland and the Coastal plains and share with the group	Completed	See action 1.15
1.12	The CSIRO salinity report prepared as part of the Padthaway project by Helen Cleugh be made available to the group. Kerry Degaris to source	Completed	Report circulated to group
1.13	Impacts of clay spreading / delving requires greater understanding – Naracoorte ranges report to be located and communicated to the group	Dan Newson to be contacted to provide clay spreading presentation to group	Address when discussion paper is prepared
1.14	Work on consumptive pools and unbundling will need to be scheduled into the groups work plan / forward agenda programme	Initial presentation done 9 Nov 2017 meeting	
1.15	More information/ discussion needed on the basis for the transition line between the Highland and the Plains	Completed	Information provided at meeting 7
2.1	Dot point summary of meetings to be supplied to SAG members within 7 business days of each meeting	Ongoing	
2.8	Propose that 140% usage be included in additional modelling scenarios	Completed	See action 3.2
3.2	Roger Cranswick (DEWNR Senior hydrogeologist) to be invited to a future meeting to discuss how the Groundwater model treats extraction and the return to the aquifer of the delivery supplement and the potential to model 140% use of all allocations	Completed	Additional modelling to be undertaken determined
3.19	NRSE Staff to review permit provisions against state wide permit provisions.	Preliminary advice provided to group	
6.1	The draft principles as agreed by the SAG members be amended ready for presentation to the Board.	Final draft completed.	Presented to Board
6.2	Staff to bring back some potential examples of unbundling and consumptive pool/s to help the group gain better understanding.	Further understanding of issues required	
6.3	Roger Cranswick to attend next meeting. (11 Jan 2018)	Completed	Attended meeting 7

Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group

Summary Meeting 7 22 February 2018 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Action	Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group Actions	Status	Outcome
6.4	Staff to bring any further advice/information gained from other areas and the CSO back to the group.	Completed	Presented at meeting 7
6.5	Staff to draft work program schedule.	Completed	Presented at meeting 7
7.1	Jen Schilling to bring back revised timeline for group endorsement		Draft presented at meeting 7
7.2	Jen Schilling & Phil Elson to review boundary options and prepare some options based on discussion		
7.3	Staff to circulate modelling report to group		
7.4	Roger Cranswick to undertake modelling of scenarios A, B & C against RCL values of 3m/10yr decline coastal flats and 5m/10yr decline highlands.		

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

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	