

Meeting Title: EP Desal Project – Site Selection Committee Meeting 09

Project Name: Eyre Peninsula Desalination Plant Project

Meeting Purpose: To provide an update on project activities

Date: Thursday 30 June 2022

Time: 11.00am – 5.00pm

Location: Port Lincoln Hotel

Attendance:

Name	Role	Present
Peter Treloar	Chair	Yes
Steve Dangerfield	Engagement Facilitator	Yes
Sandra Klein	Community Engagement	Yes
Isaac Glonek	Minute Taker	Yes
Hazel Austin	Project Manager	Yes
Nancy Nguyen	Assistant Project Manager	Yes
Dr Steve Milner	Guest speaker	Yes
Dr Don Plowman	Guest speaker	Yes
Dr Hazel Vandeleur	Guest speaker	Yes

Committee:

SSC Member	Role	Present	Proxy
Andy Dyer	President, SA Mussel Growers Association	Yes	
Brad Flaherty	Mayor, City of Port Lincoln Council	Yes	
Brian Jeffriess	Chief Executive, Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association Ltd	Yes	Kirsten Rough (online)
Bryan Trigg	Chair, Regional Development Australia Eyre Peninsula	Yes	
Claire Webber	Executive Officer, South Australian Sardine Industry Association Inc.	Yes	
Clare McLaughlin	President, Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association	Apology	Peter Scott
Delfina Lanzilli	Chief Executive, District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula	Apology	Tim Blacker
Gary Neave	Independent Project Director, TSA	Yes	
Hannah Allen-Jordan	Acting Mayor, District Council of Tumby Bay	Yes	
Jack Ritchie	Member, Port Lincoln Chamber of Commerce and Tourism	Yes	
Jo-Anne Quigley	Mayor, District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula	Apology	Leith Blacker
Jonathan Clark	General Manager, Eyre Peninsula Landscape Board	Yes	
Mark Whitfield	Chair, Eyre Peninsula Landscape Board	Yes	
Matthew Morgan	Chief Executive, City of Port Lincoln Council	Yes	
Peter Scott	Executive Officer, Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association	Yes	
Rebecca Hayes	Chief Executive, District Council of Tumby Bay	Yes	
Rob Gratton	Chief Executive, Clean Seas Seafood Limited	Yes	
Ryan Viney	Chief Executive, Regional Development Australia Eyre Peninsula	Yes	
Sam Telfer	Member for Flinders	Yes	
Shane Hodgins	Director, RecFish SA	Yes	
Thomas McNab	President, Abalone Industry Association of South Australia Inc	Yes (online)	

Tom Hyde	Member, Australian Abalone Growers Association	Present from 3.30pm	
----------	--	---------------------	--

We acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of the Eyre Peninsula. We acknowledge their elders past, present and emerging, noting in particular, their spiritual and cultural connection to the lands and coastal waters of the Eyre Peninsula.

1. Welcome and introductions

The Chair gave an Acknowledgement of Country and welcomed attendees.

Attendees were reminded that face masks are at the discretion of the individual.

The Chair noted the purpose of the meeting was to:

- Update the SSC on project activities undertaken since the last meeting and to provide summary information gathered to date on the four shortlisted sites and base case
- Update the SSC on the activities of the Funding Sub Committee
- Hear from Dr Steve Milner, contributor to the Adelaide Desalination Plant project
- Hear from Dr Don Plowman, Chair of the Independent Marine Science Review Panel, and Dr Hazel Vandeleur, SA Water's Senior Environment Impact Assessment Officer
- Assign weightings to the site selection assessment criteria
- Update the SSC on additional project activity, community engagement
- Share the media update regarding the SSC.

2. Apologies and proxies

Delfina Lanzilli was noted as an apology, with Tim Blacker attending as a proxy.

Jo-Anne Quigley was noted as an apology, with Leith Blacker attending as a proxy.

Clare McLaughlin was noted as an apology.

3. Declaration of conflicts of interest

The Chair noted SSC members are encouraged to submit any real or perceived conflicts of interest in writing.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of Meeting 8 held on 07/06/2022 were accepted.

5. Business arising

Nil noted.

6. Action items of previous meetings

The Chair noted that the open action items would be discussed as necessary throughout the course of the meeting.

7. Project activity update since last meeting

Steve noted the key activities undertaken since the last meeting:

- Site tour hosted by Shaun Ambrose from SA Water and Peter Treloar – attendees included Claire Webber, Kirsten Rough, Jono Clark, City of Port Lincoln Councillor and staff member, Dr Steve Milner, and a photographer to take photos for site visualisations
- Sleaford community meeting to discuss Sleaford North and Sleaford West (14 attendees)
- Continuing discussions with landowners
- Two Funding Sub Committee meetings
- Presentation to the SA Water Board regarding the recommendation to increase the capacity of the plant to 5.3 gigalitres per annum (30% increase from 4 gigalitres per annum) to account for defined projected growth opportunities
- Network configuration still being considered (particularly in relation to Point Boston)
- Confirmation that the Iron Knob to Kimba pipeline reversal is being brought back into the scope of this project for further development – to be discussed post-site selection
- Reviewing the operating philosophy to consider opportunities for growth and the introduction of resource optimisation tools
- Have considered options at sites that would be further explored subsequent to a site selection (e.g., subsurface intake option at Proper Bay would be pursued to further understand viability if Sleaford North was selected)
- Base options are being costed and alternative options for those sites where options exist are being considered as opportunities (costing information to be available for the next meeting on 14 July)
- Energy recovery – considering opportunities to include energy recovery innovation within the network (site dependent)
- Independent Marine Science Review Panel has met twice – update today from Dr Don Plowman.

7.1 Site planning

Base case update

Gary noted that in order to maintain the base case as a relevant point of comparison, the base case needs to be developed in parallel with the shortlisted sites.

Gary noted that the work being done on the base case in response to previous discussions at the SSC includes:

- Relocated intake from the inner bay
- Outlet has been extended to the fullest extent possible whilst still maintaining land-based pumping (approximately 4km offshore)
- Inclusion of the 5.3 gigalitre per annum capacity
- Undergrounded the power
- Undergrounded a good portion of the transfer main.

Gary noted that the comparative costing of the base case to be shared at the next meeting will account for these updated elements.

An SSC member requested that the actual location of the end of the outfall pipe in the updated base case site be shared with the SSC.

An SSC member asked if the Marine Science Review Panel (MSRP) have reviewed the updated base case configuration.

Gary noted that MSRP have not been asked to review the updated base case configuration but are reviewing the base data for the hydrodynamic modelling together with several reports provided by the industry.

An SSC member asked if the project team is aiming for a particular confidence level on the costings.

Gary noted that the quantity surveyors will provide the most accurate costings that they can, along with commentary about confidence levels.

An SSC member asked about the location of the discharge pipe from the wastewater treatment plant in relation to the location of the intake for the base case desalination plant.

Steve noted that this is not a concern for the updated base case site configuration.

Gary noted there is modelling on the dispersion of the discharge from the wastewater treatment plant that is able to provide confidence that this would not be a concern.

An SSC member asked what volume is discharged annually from the wastewater treatment plant.

Gary noted that he didn't have the number but would take this question on notice.

Uley South Shoal Point

Gary noted:

- There will be time challenges to deliver this option because of the potential for EPBC referrals and the nature of the construction of the marine works
 - Marine platform would need to be built
 - Tunnel bore through the cliff face and the availability of the equipment to do this
 - Aboriginal heritage interests
- Considering existing infrastructure upgrades to minimise costs (still assessing need for pipeline duplication)
- Despite initial thoughts around use of existing infrastructure, Uley South Shoal Point is likely to have the highest cost of the shortlisted sites
- Risk of putting all infrastructure in one location – bushfire risk could take out all infrastructure

Gary noted that there is ongoing consideration being given to the concept of clifftop bores to the saline aquifer, which could – if proved viable – be used as part of a capacity upgrade in the future. The possibility of this option will be identified for this site in the information dossier.

Point Boston

Gary noted:

- Considering the use of the existing wastewater ponds for nutrient capture from the back flush
- Reinforcement of power supply to this locality
- Presentation to the Point Boston Community Corporation Board in July

An SSC member asked if the use of the wastewater ponds would be for nutrient and salt.

Gary noted that the pre-filtration would capture nutrient from the bay and over time the filters need to be backflushed – the nutrient can either be put back into the bay, or it could potentially be captured to provide a net improvement to the marine environment.

An SSC member asked if this idea could be applied to the brine discharge from the desalination plant.

Gary noted that the project team has assessed how large an evaporation pond would need to be for the volume of water being processed, and it would be many hectares and therefore not viable.

Gary noted the flushing timescale provided by an SSC member has been provided to the MSRP and commentary will be provided prior to the scoring process on 28 July.

Gary noted that hydrodynamic modelling will consider the flushing timescale and verify the relationship between the outfall and dispersion and accumulation.

Steve noted that subject to the science and the views of the regulator, an extended outfall may be warranted and considered for this site as an opportunity cost.

An SSC member noted that aquaculture operators are assessed on the risk of their operations based on the flushing rates.

Gary noted that the parallels between nutrient and saline accumulation will be tested, to get a better understanding of the risk related to salinity, rather than the risk related to nutrient.

An SSC member noted that what the community looks at and what the regulator looks at is the damage done to the environment, particularly the loss of seagrass. If saline discharge does have a negative effect on seagrass, there would be risk around reduced stocking for aquaculture, social licence challenges and environmental concerns.

Gary noted that this will be looked at by the MSRP and an opinion provided based on the information available.

An SSC member questioned the cost of increasing the length of the outfall at Point Boston to the fullest extent possible whilst still maintaining land-based pumping, and the reduction in risk as a result.

Gary noted that this information will be provided in the full costings.

An SSC member noted that the cliffs at the beach are quite high at the location of the intake and outfall pipes in the proposed configuration at Point Boston.

Gary noted that whichever site is selected will be designed to a greater level of detail to account for this kind of consideration, but this cannot be done at this point because a single configuration needed to be selected for each site to allow costing work to be undertaken.

Sleaford West

Steve noted:

- Abalone presence
- Discounting the crevice option due to similar geotechnical constraints that saw the site relocate to Billy Lights Point

Steve noted there are several different plant configurations that could be considered at Sleaford West (e.g., the desalination plant located near Fishery Bay Road, rather than near the coast).

Steve noted that there is consideration being given to an alternative option at Sleaford West with the intake and outfall pipes located underground and extending into the ocean at Fishery Bay, with a pumpstation near the existing toilet block and an opportunity to upgrade community infrastructure.

Gary noted that Fishery Bay does present a greater length pipeline and higher costs compared to some of the other options.

An SSC member noted that there would be difficulty in achieving social licence at Fishery Bay given the community attachment to that location.

Steve noted that the Sleaford community expressed similar views and that he was engaging in further conversations with key stakeholders to understand further why this is the case.

An SSC member noted the presence of abalone out from Sandy Point – the economic value of this location is significant for the abalone industry and the broader economy.

Gary noted that this will be investigated from a marine science point of view, similar to Point Boston.

Sleaford North

Steve noted:

- Sub-surface innovative intake option from Proper Bay with discharge at Sleaford North is presenting issues with regards to ongoing maintenance – undertaking any further work on this option is therefore on hold pending outcome of site selection process
- Engineering challenges due to length of intake and outfall
- Aware of community concerns on visible amenity on coastline

Steve shared the proposed configuration at Sleaford North.

Steve noted that there are Aboriginal heritage considerations that need to be understood further.

Steve noted that the Sleaford community have concerns about the whales that aggregate in Sleaford Bay close to this site.

8. Funding Sub Committee update

Brad Flaherty noted that two Funding Sub Committee (FSC) meetings have been held since the last SSC meeting.

Brad noted that additional funding will be required for any of the shortlisted sites.

Brad noted that he and the Chair will meet with the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water next week.

Brad noted the need for water security, as well as the added imperative of water security for economic growth.

A paper has been prepared by the project team to support discussions with Government agencies and respective Ministers.

9. Guest speaker – Dr Steve Milner

Steve Milner noted that he joined the Adelaide Desalination Plant project in 2008 as a project manager and was involved from concept design through to operational management of the plant.

In the years before the Adelaide Desalination Plant was built, there was a reduction of inflows to the River Murray and the Mt Lofty Ranges as a consequence of drought. Around 2007, a working group made a recommendation to the then State Government that a desalination plant was the solution to securing a climate-independent water supply for Adelaide. A 50 gigalitre per annum plant was originally planned, but this was revised to 100 gigalitres per annum due to the ongoing drought.

The site that the plant was built on was a greenfield site between Hallett Cove and the Port Stanvac oil refinery, with the Christies Beach wastewater treatment plant to the south. It was a site surrounded by many interested stakeholders.

Environmental Performance Criteria for the design:

- Intake system had to be designed with low velocity to avoid entrainment of organisms
- Outfall design to achieve a 50 to 1 initial dilution at the diffuser
 - No discharge of chemicals
 - No particulate matters discharged
 - No temperature increase
 - No impact on marine flora and fauna in the vicinity of the diffusers
 - Plume discharge not to reach the surface
- Minimal energy usage, including energy recovery
- Minimum impact on land during construction and operation
- Renewable energy supply

Outfall design:

- 6 diffusers on the seabed
- Plant was designed to run from 52m above sea level, down to a platform 32m above sea level at the edge of the cliffs with a shaft down to sea level and then a tunnel 1.1km out to sea
- Diffusers needed to meet 50 to 1 initial dilution at all times, including with the plant running at full capacity

Steve Milner noted that for the Adelaide Desalination Plant, for every 1000L of seawater drawn in through the intake, 470L of desalinated water is produced and 530L of concentrated seawater is returned through the outfall.

EPA performance requirements for dispersion:

- For 90% of the time, the outfall discharge achieves a dilution of 50:1, and 100:1 in local salinity
- For 10% of the time (i.e., temporary peak salinity) 1.3 parts per thousand licence conditions are not exceeded
- Design reviewed by Independent Technical Review Panel – this panel verified the science behind the design of the plant and the engineering/technical aspects
- During the proving phase, a test was run with the plant at full capacity over a severe dodge tide for a 24-hour period and the saline dispersal met the EPA requirements

Steve Milner noted:

- The Gulf St Vincent experiences 12000 gigalitres of evaporation each year
- Desalination removes fresh water, equivalent to evaporation
- Average 33 gigalitres of evaporation in a day, or 1.3 gigalitres per hour
- Considering that the Gulf St Vincent has a turnover time of 4 months, 100 gigalitres of desal activity would correspond to 0.003 parts per thousand increase in salinity
- 50-year projections suggested that climate change would correspond to a 0.066 parts per thousand increase in salinity

An SSC member asked if there were alternative sites considered for the Adelaide Desalination Plant and suggested that another site was discounted due to it being a lower energy environment.

Steve Milner noted that the desalination working group considered a range of sites – all sites were looked at in detail, including mixing, energy on the coastline, proximity to people, and proximity to seagrass. A multicriteria analysis was undertaken.

An SSC member asked if all of the sites considered were similar in terms of the marine conditions and tidal flows.

Steve Milner noted that all sites assessed were on the same section of coast – up to North Haven – and that the marine conditions were fairly similar across all sites.

An SSC member asked if the MCA for the Adelaide Desalination Plant project was available for the SSC to review.

Steve Dangerfield noted that he would take this question on notice.

An SSC member asked about the total capital expenditure on the Adelaide Desalination Plant, as well as the operational expenditure.

Steve Milner noted that the total capital expenditure was \$1.86 billion, and that operational expenditure depends on the capacity at which the plant is operating.

10. Guest speakers – Dr Don Plowman and Dr Hazel Vandeleur

Don Plowman noted that he was providing a preliminary report and an overview of the considerations of the Marine Science Review Panel (MSRP) as its Chair.

Don noted that while Dr Hazel Vandeleur isn't a member of the MSRP, he was strongly of the view that there needed to be a good connection between the MSRP and SA Water to ensure efficient operation.

Don noted the other members of the MSRP as follows:

- Dr Ian Wallis who is an environmental engineer and has been involved in many desalination projects
- Dr John Luick who is an oceanographer and expert in hydrodynamic modelling

- Professor Sean Conneell who is a marine ecologist and environmental scientist
- Dr Anu Kumar who is an environmental toxicologist and environmental risk assessor
- Dr Alistair Hobday who is an oceanographer and expert in spatial management and migration of pelagic species

Don noted that the MSRP is a very experienced group, that is keen to ensure that they provide good advice to the SSC in the site selection phase and also during the construction and operation phases of the desalination plant.

Don noted that the MSRP have reviewed the Environmental Performance Criteria – the MSRP's assessment is that this is a fairly standard set of criteria for this type of project, however suggested three additional items be included:

1. A more explicit statement around the importance of the fishing and aquaculture industry to the region
2. The design principles should specifically refer to the project meeting the EPA (Environmental Protection Authority) and ANZECC (Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council) guidelines
3. The design principles should specifically refer to the project contributing to the enhancement of the marine environment

Don noted that these changes have been made, and the final Environmental Performance Criteria will be shared with the SSC.

Don noted that the MSRP have reviewed the SARDI (South Australian Research and Development Institute) hydrodynamic modelling. The volume of material being assessed is substantial and complex. The model has been preliminarily validated – more time is needed for full validation, however the MSRP consider it sufficient for use as an interrogative tool. The model has 15 layers and the MSRP is seeking differentiation between those 15 layers in terms of flow. The model provides information about movement of water, and there has been some discussion amongst the MSRP of the relative contributions of tides and wind to that movement – it could be advantageous to be able to look at the impact of tides and wind separately to assess where the outfall would be best located.

Don noted that the MSRP are looking at what the likely impacts are of the combination of flows, stratification, and brine being injected – they hope to provide some commentary on this in mid-July to assist with the SSC's decision-making at the end of July.

Don noted that two MSRP members are very experienced in larval transport modelling, and there is interest in where larvae are primarily located in Boston Bay.

Don noted that the MSRP have discussed that if Boston Bay is treated as a homogenous entity, the amount of water being extracted for desalination is very small in relation to the total amount of water in Boston Bay. As such, the MSRP is strongly of the view that water extraction should not have a significant impact on larvae in the water column, unless it is located directly adjacent to a spawning location. Further modelling is needed. Don noted that the MSRP do not have any information on particle tracking and changes in flow at this point – this information is critical to this statement.

Don noted that the MSRP received a first report from SARDI with fish assemblage information, which is a documentation of the species in the area and the impacts of temperature and salinity on those species. The MSRP have asked SARDI for some further information. If this information is combined with the salinity and temperature tolerances from the outfall of the desalination plant, then there should be a clear understanding of the potential impacts on the species present.

Don noted that the MSRP has reviewed a seagrass and habitat mapping report and there are no significant concerns in terms of seagrass distribution. The MSRP will receive a report on habitat modelling before their next meeting, which will be helpful in getting a better understanding of the potential impacts of the outfall on the surrounding marine habitat.

Don noted that there are two major points of discussion and assessment for the MSRP:

1. Location and impact of the intake:

- a. The MSRP believes that with the knowledge of the areas where mussel spat primarily are, and flexibility in the location of the intake pipe, this should be achievable without significant impact on the mussel industry because the volumes of water are small.
2. Location and impact of the outlet structure:
 - a. The MSRP do not have any advice at present – there is a lot of work being done at the moment around flows and where it would be best placed for each site. There would not be a problem at the high energy sites (i.e., Sleaford North, Sleaford West, and Uley South Shoal Point).
 - b. The focus of the modelling is on the bays, and the potential impact of the outfall will depend on the flow in the locality in the bay and the engineering of the outlet structure. The criteria set is a 40:1 dilution and based on this, the MSRP's preliminary assessment is that salinity should not pose an issue if appropriately designed.

Don invited the SSC to let him know if there is any further information that the SSC wants from the MSRP prior to the SSC meeting on 28 July.

The Chair thanked Don for his update and noted that in his view, the establishment of the MSRP brings a level of rigour to the site selection process that gives comfort to the broader community.

An SSC member noted that the issue is the relationship between price and risk associated with the location of the outlet pipe and asked if the MSRP are assessing this.

Don noted that the MSRP has been asked to provide commentary and input in the initial site selection phase, but their involvement will continue into the design and construction phases. The advice provided by the MSRP will depend on the information available on water flows at the location of the desalination plant.

Hazel Vandeleur noted that cost is not a driver in the MSRP's guidance principles – the science is the driver. The MSRP's remit is science, cost is a matter for the Project Director. The MSRP's role is to advise whether the data provided is appropriate, relevant, and sufficient.

Don noted that if the SSC selects a site, the MSRP will be able to provide further commentary on the likely impacts of locating the intake and outlet in particular locations. The MSRP's role will not be to decide the location of the intake and outlet structures but provide advice to assist the decision makers.

An SSC member asked if the MSRP is satisfied with the amount of data available, and the ability to access supplementary information.

Don noted that the hydrodynamic model will not be fully validated by the end of July 2022, but that the MSRP will provide advice on the basis that the model looks satisfactory at this point. The MSRP's role will be to make judgments and provide their expert advice to the SSC in line with their assessment of the best information available. The MSRP is seeking additional information about the most significant locations for mussel larvae, in order to avoid those locations in placing any outfall or intake.

An SSC member asked if the MSRP will consider outfall into relatively closed systems like bays compared to relatively open ocean, as well as likelihood and impacts of accumulation in the bays.

Don noted that the MSRP will be focusing on the bays and that he is confident in the MSRP's ability to answer questions about accumulation in the bays and the associated impacts following the review of the various reports to be delivered in the next few weeks.

An SSC member noted that there is an engineering solution to virtually any problem, while the MSRP won't be providing commentary about cost, it would be useful if the MSRP could provide advice about the relationship between risk and the length and location of the outlet structure for a given site, as well as the outlet pipeline length needed to have equal risk at all shortlisted sites.

Don noted that a full risk assessment will be done once a site is selected. If the SSC feels like it needs more information to make its decision on a recommended site, the MSRP will do its best to provide that advice.

An SSC member noted that they would like the MSRP to rate the sites from an environmental impact point of view, based on the configurations being used for costing.

Gary noted that the configurations being used for costing are starting points, and the exact locations of intake and outlet structures and engineering solutions will be guided by the science.

Don noted that the MSRP could consider how they might rate the sites in this way if it will assist the SSC's decision-making.

An SSC member noted that reducing the risks around the outfall seems to be straightforward in that it relies on appropriate location of the outlet structure and asked what the considerations are for reducing the risk around the intake.

Don noted that in the MSRP's view, so long as the intake isn't directly adjacent to a mussel larvae spawning area, the impact will be very minor.

Hazel Vandeleur noted that the design of the intake is an engineering matter. There are other design mitigation measures that will be considered, such as the location, the initial speed of intake, and positioning the intake above the seabed.

An SSC member asked if nutrient would be removed from the bays as part of the desalination process.

Gary noted that there is an option to consider at Point Boston around using the existing wastewater ponds for nutrient capture from the back flush but as a standard position, nutrients drawn in are, through the backwashing process, discharged out.

Hazel Vandeleur noted that in terms of nutrient, whatever is taken out is essentially returned.

11. Assessment criteria weighting workshop

Hazel Austin facilitated a workshop for the SSC to collaboratively decide which assessment criteria are the most important, relative to each other.

SSC members were initially asked to vote on the main criteria on a 1-10 basis, where 1 is less important and 10 is more important:

- Environment
- Social and Community
- Technical
- Property
- Financial

Percentage weightings were then derived based on the average score assigned to each criterion by the SSC.

This process was then repeated for the sub-criteria below each main criteria, with considerable discussion had by the SSC in the course of this workshop.

12. Summary of weightings – check in

The SSC briefly reviewed the draft weightings assigned to the assessment criteria throughout the workshop.

Generally, the SSC agreed with the weightings that had been allocated through the process. The SSC agreed to review these weightings once distributed post-meeting and to confirm the weightings at the next meeting.

13. Additional project updates

Nil noted.

14. Media update

The Chair noted that he will consider media requirements and interest and whether comment should be provided to the media following this meeting.

15. Other business

The Chair noted that he and Brad Flaherty will be meeting with the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water next week.

16. Next meeting and close

An agenda for the next meeting will be circulated prior to the next meeting, set for **Thursday 14 July from 1.30pm to 5.00pm.**

With no further comments, the meeting closed at 5.02pm.

Open action items register

No.	Action Description	By Whom	Date Raised	Date Due	Status
1	Seek advice on alternative construction methodologies – concept design team to consider and engage with industry to identify synergies and leverage knowledge.	Project Team	03/03/22	TBC	Defer to when a site is selected
2	Develop concept designs for the four shortlisted sites: Uley South Shoal Point, Sleaford West, Sleaford North, and Point Boston.	Project Team	11/04/22	TBC	In progress
3	Assessment of the Northern Precinct as a separate project – independently from the functions of the SSC – to look at the viability of supporting economic development in the northern region.	Project Team	07/03/22	TBC	Open
4	Liaise with SA Power Networks to confirm if detailed pricing of electricity infrastructure can be shared with the SSC.	Project Team	11/04/22	TBC	In progress
5	Independent Marine Science Review Panel (MSRP) to review the Environmental Performance Criteria and pass comment to the design team. MSRP comments on the Environmental Performance Criteria to be shared with SSC.	MSRP	19/05/22	TBC	Closed
6	Draft a new scope and set of parameters for the base case site at Billy Lights Point to provide a true comparison with the four shortlisted sites.	Project Team	19/05/22	TBC	In progress
7	Prepare a visual representation of the desalination plant and pumping station at each shortlisted site.	Project Team	07/06/22	TBC	In progress
8	Location of the outlet structure in the updated base case site to be shared with the SSC.	Project Team	30/06/22	14/07/22	Closed
9	Volume of discharge per annum from the wastewater treatment plant to be shared with the SSC.	Project Team	30/06/22	14/07/22	In progress
10	MCA from the Adelaide Desalination Plant project to be shared with the SSC if available.	Project Team	30/06/22	14/07/22	In progress
11	Final Environmental Performance Criteria to be shared with the SSC.	Project Team	30/06/22	14/07/22	In progress
12	Draft weightings of assessment criteria to be distributed to the SSC.	Project Team	30/06/22	01/07/22	Closed