

Meeting Title: EP Desal Project – Site Selection Committee Meeting 10

Project Name: Eyre Peninsula Desalination Plant Project

Meeting Purpose: To provide an update on project activities

Date: Thursday 14 July 2022

Time: 1.30pm – 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 Don Plowman	Guest speaker	Yes (online)
Dr Hazel Vandeleur	Guest speaker	Yes (online)

Committee:

SSC Member	Role	Present	Proxy
Andy Dyer	President, SA Mussel Growers Association	Apology	Andrew Puglisi
Brad Flaherty	Mayor, City of Port Lincoln Council	Yes	
Brian Jeffriess	Chief Executive, Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association Ltd	Yes (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	Yes	
Gary Neave	Independent Project Director, TSA	Yes (online)	
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	Yes	
Jonathan Clark	General Manager, Eyre Peninsula Landscape Board	Yes (online)	
Mark Whitfield	Chair, Eyre Peninsula Landscape Board	Apology	Steve Milner
Matthew Morgan	Chief Executive, City of Port Lincoln Council	Yes	
Peter Scott	Executive Officer, Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association	Yes (online)	
Rebecca Hayes	Chief Executive, District Council of Tumby Bay	Yes	
Rob Gratton	Chief Executive, Clean Seas Seafood Limited	Yes (online for the first hour)	
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	Yes	
----------	--	-----	--

We acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of the Eyre Peninsula. We acknowledge their elders past and present, 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 Don Plowman, Chair of the Independent Marine Science Review Panel, and Dr Hazel Vandeleur, SA Water's Senior Environment Impact Assessment Officer
- Check in on the assessment criteria weightings and close out
- Identify information requirements for the information dossier
- Share the media update regarding the SSC.

2. Apologies and proxies

Andy Dyer was noted as an apology, with Andrew Puglisi attending as a proxy.

Clare McLaughlin was noted as an apology, with Peter Scott attending as a proxy.

Mark Whitfield was noted as an apology, with Steve Milner attending as a proxy.

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 9 held on 30/06/2022 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

Steve noted the key activities undertaken since the last meeting:

- Second site tour hosted by the Chair and Shaun Ambrose (SA Water): Brad Flaherty, Bryan Trigg, Mark Whitfield, and Matthew Morgan attended
- Continuing discussions with landowners – Sleaford West, Point Boston

- Sleaford North landowner discussions very positive with opportunity to work together to deliver an outcome
- Funding Sub Committee (FSC) Chair and SSC Chair met with the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, and a further FSC meeting was held on 14 July
- SA Water have increased the capacity of the plant by 30% to 5.3 gigalitres per annum
- Initial costing information for each site has been produced and is in review with constructability experts who are price checking the pipe and marine works
- Independent Marine Science Review Panel have received a briefing noted from SARDI (13 July) which they will review at their next meeting
- Options at each site in addition to the base configuration continue to be explored and will be documented (i.e., if site x is selected, these are the modifications/options that can be considered through further work)
- Discussions recommenced with Barnagarla – plans sent to identify whether there are any immediate issues
- Version 1 of the information dossier is being finalised – to be distributed early next week.

Construction methodology update

- Point Boston and Sleaford West sites will require a trench dug through the coastal zone for installation of the pipes (which will be repaired) Billy Lights Point as the base case is also being costed to this methodology with the trench to be constructed along the wastewater treatment plant outfall alignment
- Sleaford North – if in rock, will require a wet well which will incur further cost
- A permanent jetty could be constructed at Point Boston and Sleaford North to get the pipe from the pumping station to the sea

Base case – Billy Lights Point

Steve noted the work that has been done on the base case to establish an effective comparison:

- Relocated the intake and outfall pipes (intake approximately 400 metres from coast, outfall approximately 2.5km into more open ocean area)
- Opportunity for value add which would provide a 10% increase in supply and help to remove nutrient load from the gulf (using the wastewater treatment plant outfall) - noting that such an opportunity would require additional community acceptance
- Undergrounding the power and the pipeline
- Increase capacity of the plant to 5.3 gigalitres per annum
- Updated budget estimate of \$250M-\$280M (includes capacity increase and the upper estimate includes the extended pipeline)

Steve shared the updated configuration of the base case site at Billy Lights Point.

An SSC member questioned whether the outfall in the updated base case configuration is in the open ocean or still in the bay

Steve noted that the outfall is in Boston Bay, but a lot further out than where it was originally positioned.

An SSC member questioned whether the base case costing includes a subsurface intake.

Steve noted that the updated base case configuration has a standard intake and is priced as such.

Gary noted that a subsurface intake can be considered as an alternative option for the base case.

Steve emphasised that Billy Lights Point is being looked at as a base case for the purpose of comparative analysis with the site the SSC selects as its preferred site.

Gary noted that this innovation (accessing the wastewater discharge) would be considered as part of a capacity upgrade when needed by the market, where other sites would require an increase in the volume of desalination.

Steve noted that Billy Lights Point has benefits and opportunities but doesn't have a social licence and won't be scored by the SSC as the SSC's task is to recommend an alternative site to the Government and SA Water.

Point Boston

Steve shared the base configuration of the Point Boston site.

Steve noted that the further away the plant is from the pumpstation on the coast – i.e., longer intake and outfall pipes – the more expensive the plant is.

Steve noted that a discussion will be had with the Point Boston Development Corporation Board regarding the possibility of locating the plant closer to the coast.

Steve noted:

- Opportunity within network to add mini-hydropower system for energy recovery
- Cost to underground part of the pipe and powerlines has been included in initial cost estimate – opportunity for potential savings if these are overhead
- Investigating opportunity to locate plant closer to coast to reduce cost
- Community benefit opportunity is substantial at this location, e.g., boat/caravan storage, boat ramp, mini jetty and screening
- Native vegetation manageable (minimal clearance needed)
- Development Corporation Board presentation/discussion on 20 July – supportive to date on the basis of community benefits being considered.

Steve noted the following high risks at Point Boston:

- Aquaculture industry concerns – in discussion and being considered by MSRP
- Pipe length (currently up to 3.5km) dependent upon science regarding any relationship between nutrient and saline discharge / accumulation
- Some resident concerns expressed via the Community Corporation Board.

An SSC member asked whether water supply for the development is one of the community benefit considerations at Point Boston.

Steve noted that water supply is a key issue at Point Boston and certainly part of the discussion.

An SSC member asked if the extra cost of reversing the pipeline from Summit Tanks to North Side Hill Tanks has been considered.

Gary noted that the designers have had a preliminary look at the pipeline reversal – there could be a saving of around 7km of pipe, and there would be some changes required to the network to deliver the water quality improvements in the project objectives. The changes required to the network would likely offset a significant amount of the savings from the reduced length of pipe, but it does seem that there would be a saving. There could also be some network benefits where water could be supplied to areas of the town that are without water.

An SSC member noted that there will be different technical solutions for different sites and that information about the operational efficiencies of each site would be useful.

Gary noted that this has been considered and accounted for in the operational costings, at a high-level. This will be reflected in the indicative net present value (NPV) for each site.

An SSC member noted that Point Boston has the potential of experiencing timeline delays due to potential litigation, and that this should be part of the SSC's considerations.

Steve noted that timeline risks must be considered for all sites, and this information will be presented in the information dossier. Steve also noted that all of the shortlisted sites have stakeholder matters

and risks to consider, with at least two other stakeholders indicating that they may take matters further if a particular site is selected.

Gary noted that the MSRP will provide commentary on the marine-based risks and engineering responses to those risks.

Steve noted that the current process is attempting to de-risk all of the shortlisted sites.

Gary noted that there are legislative risks currently under consideration for Sleaford North, Sleaford West and Uley South Shoal Point, especially regarding timeframes for approvals (i.e., Aboriginal heritage, state marine park zoning, etc.).

Sleaford West

Steve shared the base configuration of the Sleaford West site.

Steve noted:

- Opportunity for mini-hydropower system at Duck Ponds
- Sleaford community broadly supportive (with one or two individuals remaining against the idea) – for the majority of locals however, this site is seen as a compromise
- Other configurations unlikely to have support (e.g., closer to Fishery Bay Road or entering into Fishery Bay)
- Appears not to be an issue for First Nations peoples although this is subject to a detailed heritage survey
- Is of significant concern to the owners of the ecotourism business who have two eco-huts on site and consider the desal plant to be completely incompatible with their business and what they are selling (a unique and pristine experience with private beach access).

An SSC member noted that they have been contacted by community members who are concerned about any impacts to the nationally threatened hooded plovers that nest on the beach at Sandy Point.

Steve noted that he has received this information as well, and that it will be important to be able to demonstrate appropriate management of this issue.

Steve noted the following high risks at Sleaford West:

- Construction timeframes – challenging ocean conditions and environmental issues with respect to hooded plovers
- Distance from network increases cost
- Ecotourism business
- Abalone presence and underwater reef off Sandy Point.

Gary noted that drilling from the plant to Sandy Point through the dunes and beach area could be challenging due to the geology, and costs would escalate. The methodology currently being considered is time consuming and constrained by weather conditions.

An SSC member asked if SA Water would need to create an exclusion zone for diving around the intake and outfall that could affect the abalone industry.

Gary noted that there would be exclusion zones to prevent potential damage to intake and outfall infrastructure, but not to the degree that it would prevent abalone diving.

An SSC member asked if the MSRP are considering potential impact on the abalone industry at Sleaford West.

Hazel Vandeleur noted that the MSRP are considering any potential impacts on the marine environment at all sites, but that abalone presence at Sleaford West could be specifically noted for the MSRP's consideration.

Sleaford North

Steve shared the base configuration of the Sleaford North site.

Steve noted:

- First Nations peoples have expressed concern at proximity to heritage area and this is their least preferred site
- Sleaford North does however provide some opportunity to explore alternatives, including the possibility of a subsurface intake in Proper Bay
- Sleaford residents do not support this site as it is considered too close to the marine sanctuary and whale aggregation area and is too prominent a location.

Steve noted the following high risks at Sleaford North:

- Whales (noise)
- Abalone presence
- Construction timeframes – challenging ocean conditions
- Aboriginal heritage interests
- Community sentiment.

Uley South Shoal Point

Steve shared the base configuration of the Uley South Shoal Point site.

Steve noted:

- Cliff top bores to saline aquifer under consideration – timeframes for delivery an issue and would only be considered in future stages
- Alternative option to bottom end of Gunyah Beach significantly more costly and compromised by proximity to marine park sanctuary zone
- Will require 3m diameter bore through the cliffs – up to approximately 2km long (with only 600m into the ocean)
- Geology in the area is significant – porous and subject to sink holes
- SA Water currently has operational management plans they need to implement to protect the aquifer (e.g., from diesel spills) - and the construction of a desal plant would be subject to similar regulations.

Steve noted the following high risks at Uley South Shoal Point:

- Aquifer at risk of pollution from construction/diesel spills, requiring significant construction environmental management plan to be in place
- A bushfire or operational issues could risk the region's entire water supply
- Will trigger EPBC referral which will add time to the delivery schedule
- More than \$100 million above next most expensive site due to the drilling required
- Minimum 12-month delay to first potable water on current timelines (could potentially increase up to 18 months subject to EPBC referral) making it impossible to deliver first water by December 2024.

Hazel Vandeleur noted that there are records of 4 protected species at Uley South Shoal Point, as well as records of coastal habitat of very high quality – which would mean that the native vegetation clearance application would have to run in line with an EPBC referral. This would likely trigger a controlled action on the EPBC referral in this area, due to the quality of the coastal habitat and the species present.

An SSC member asked about potential EPBC referrals at the other shortlisted sites.

Hazel noted that an EPBC referral is also likely at Sleaford West and Sleaford North because of the nearby marine park sanctuary zone – at this stage it is uncertain as to whether it will be seen as a controlled action at Sleaford until the referral, however the risk of triggering a controlled action is much higher at Uley South Shoal Point.

Gary noted that SA Water operations are not comfortable with the bushfire risk associated with locating the region's entire water supply in one location.

An SSC member noted that after visiting the site, they believe Uley South Shoal Point is not a viable option and it presents too great a risk in delivering water security for the region.

An SSC member proposed that given the risks associated with the ability to deliver water security for the region within a reasonable timeline and the ongoing risks associated with placing the region's water infrastructure all in one location, that Uley South Shoal Point be excluded from further consideration.

The Chair accepted the proposal, which was seconded, and sought SSC endorsement.

The SSC agreed that Uley South Shoal Point should be excluded from further consideration.

8. Project costings

Steve noted:

- Initial costings have been provided by the estimators
- There is a level of uncertainty with each of the sites as they currently stand making it challenging to calculate costs without adding contingency and a degree of conservatism
- Updated base case site at Billy Lights Point has been costed at between \$250 – \$280 million
- Initial pricing currently receiving input from constructors
- Pricing as close as can be practically achieved in the timeframe will be provided as a critical input to the SSC's decision-making.

Gary noted that the estimators have provided their input with a high level of conservatism around risk for the shortlisted sites, but there needs to be input from constructors to balance this conservatism.

9. Funding Sub Committee update

Brad Flaherty noted that the Funding Sub Committee (FSC) has been exploring various ideas for attracting extra funding.

Brad noted that Ryan Viney, through Regional Development Australia, assisted in facilitating a discussion between the FSC and Infrastructure Australia, and that initial discussions with Infrastructure Australia were promising.

The Chair noted that he has requested a meeting with the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development to discuss a proposal for funding through the National Water Grid Authority following the meeting with the Deputy Premier.

10. Marine Science Review Panel

Don Plowman noted that since his last presentation to the SSC, the Marine Science Review Panel (MSRP) have received further information about the habitats in Boston Bay, complementing the University of Adelaide's sequence reports (1991, 2008, 2015, 2021). There is also work completed by the CSIRO and EPA (2010, 2016). The MSRP now has quite a lot of data about marine habitats, particularly the presence of seagrasses.

Don noted that the MSRP have received a report prepared by SA Water about the underwater noise assessment in Sleaford Bay. Don also noted that the MSRP have received a preliminary report from SARDI on the far-field modelling of brine discharges – as SARDI's modelling is due to be completed in October, this is an interim report with SARDI's initial findings from their work so far.

Don noted that by their next meeting on 20 July, the MSRP will have a reasonable amount of information about dynamics of the outfall structures – the MSRP will be able to consider the natural variation of salinity in the bay, and what potential impacts the discharge of brine will have.

Don noted that his intention is that the MSRP's report to the SSC will have a summary of the reports received by the MSRP as they relate to the shortlisted sites as well as a table that comments on each shortlisted site in the context of the SSC's assessment criteria.

Don noted that MSRP, per the SSC's request, will attempt to provide some commentary about the perceived risks for each shortlisted site. Don also noted that a risk assessment is a highly complex piece of work, and the MSRP's commentary would be reliant upon its members having a particular level of confidence about their individual assessment of the data available.

Don noted that he's confident that the MSRP will be able to provide advice that assists the SSC in their decision-making.

An SSC member asked if the MSRP will be able to assess the Sleaford North alternative options.

Hazel Vandeleur noted that there is already habitat mapping for this area, there is an ADCP (acoustic Doppler current profiler) installed that will provide information about the current, and there is also water quality testing being undertaken.

11. Assessment criteria weightings

Steve noted that this was an opportunity for members to raise any concerns prior to the weightings being finalised ahead of site scoring on 28 July.

Steve shared the weightings allocated to the top-level assessment criteria by the SSC at its last meeting as follows:

Environment	26.85%
Social and Community	24.69%
Financial	23.46%
Technical	13.27%
Property	11.73%

The SSC agreed that the top-level assessment criteria weightings were appropriate and did not require any changes.

Steve shared the weightings allocated to the Environment sub-criteria by the SSC at its last meeting.

The SSC agreed that the Environment sub-criteria weightings were appropriate and did not require any changes.

Steve shared the weightings allocated to the Social and Community sub-criteria by the SSC at its last meeting.

An SSC member noted, in relation to the recreational fishing criterion (i.e., the extent to which recreational fishing may be affected), there are many other areas for recreational fishing and that it should be given less weighting amongst the Social and Community sub-criteria.

An SSC member noted that none of the weightings should be changed.

An SSC member noted that the weighting for recreational fishing should not be changed, considering the number of recreational fishers in the community.

An SSC member noted that recreational fishing should not be weighted higher than one of the amenity value criteria (i.e., the extent to which building design blends with existing landscape and minimises visual amenity issues to neighbours), given the vast areas available to recreational fishers.

An SSC member noted that the recreational fishing criterion is to do with proximity to the intake/outfall and exclusion zones, rather than any potential impact on stocks – given this, other concerns for recreational fishing are considered in the Environment sub-criteria.

Steve asked for the SSC to provide direction on whether the weighting for the recreational fishing criterion should be decreased.

An SSC member noted that from a probity perspective, the SSC spent a lot of time deriving the weightings, and that it would be problematic to change the weightings on an ad-hoc basis.

After further discussion, the SSC agreed that the Social and Community sub-criteria weightings were appropriate and did not require any changes.

Steve shared the weightings allocated to the Financial sub-criteria by the SSC at its last meeting.

An SSC member noted that because there are only three Financial sub-criteria, their individual weightings are much higher than the individual weightings for other sub-criteria and questioned whether this is a concern.

An SSC member noted that funding for the project is of great importance and that the weightings should not be changed.

An SSC member noted that they originally had concerns about the individual weightings of the Financial sub-criteria but recognised that, for example, there are three Environment sub-criteria for the outfall with a combined weighting of 8.62% – which is comparable to the individual weightings of the Financial sub-criteria. On this basis, the SSC member suggested that the weightings were appropriate.

The SSC agreed that the Financial sub-criteria weightings were appropriate and did not require any changes.

Steve shared the weightings allocated to the Technical sub-criteria by the SSC at its last meeting.

Steve noted that he had received a comment that the lead times/construction program criterion may be underrepresented and asked the SSC to provide direction.

Gary noted that the remaining three sites are achievable in line with the project timeline, and while there is some risk around timing of approvals, early procurement would assist in meeting the project timeline from a lead times/construction program perspective. As such the weighting for this criterion is adequate.

The SSC agreed that the Technical sub-criteria weightings were appropriate and did not require any changes.

Steve shared the weightings allocated to the Property sub-criteria by the SSC at its last meeting.

The SSC agreed that the property sub-criteria weightings were appropriate and did not require any changes.

Scoring process

With regard to the scoring process, Steve noted the following steps:

1. The SSC will be required to score each site against the assessment criteria – not in comparison to the other sites
2. Scoring will be against each sub-criteria using a scale of 1-5, based on the information provided in the dossier
3. Process being proposed:
 - a. Discuss the first top-level criterion (i.e., Environment)
 - b. Score each site against the Environment sub-criteria
 - c. Discuss the next top-level criterion (i.e., Social and Community)
 - d. Score each site against the Social and Community sub-criteria, and so on
4. Scores will deliver an outcome for the SSC to take forward.

An SSC member noted that they would not be comfortable with endorsing a site based on the scoring process alone without the opportunity for further discussion – noting that the site ranked first through the scoring process could have significant showstoppers that would make the SSC uncomfortable with recommending that site.

Several SSC members noted that they agreed with this comment.

An SSC member noted that there needs to be a process for moderating post-scoring discussion, to ensure that one person alone can't attempt to overrule the outcome of the scoring process and potentially delay the SSC's recommendation.

The Chair noted that there would need to be a mover and second behind any motion to deviate from the result of the scoring process and noted that the Terms of Reference states:

“Where a decision is required and it is not possible to reach a unanimous agreement, the chair shall call for a vote. It shall be at the Chair’s discretion as to whether the vote shall be taken in public or by private ballot. If a vote is required a 75% majority must be achieved in order for a decision to be carried.”

On this basis, it was agreed that the SSC would reserve the right to discuss the outcome of the scoring process and make a determination as to whether a change to the outcome is warranted. Any such decision would be made on the basis of the TOR voting process outlined above.

12. Information dossier

With regard to the information dossier, Steve noted the following process:

1. Version 1 available midday Monday 18 July
2. SSC have 48 hours until midday Wednesday 20 July to comment
3. Project Team then have 48 hours to update in line with SSC comments
4. Version 2 available midday Friday 22 July.

An SSC member requested that members be provided with an A3 sheet with all of the assessment criteria at the meeting on Tuesday 26 July, ahead of site scoring on 28 July.

Steve noted that this could be arranged.

13. Media update

The Chair noted that no comment was provided to the media following the previous meeting, however there will be a media update following this meeting. The Chair also noted that thought is being given to the messaging once the SSC selects the site it will be recommending and the process for making the decision public will be discussed with the SSC at the meeting on 26 July.

14. Other business

The Chair noted that he and Brad Flaherty met with the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water last week to discuss the project. The Chair noted that from his perspective, the meeting went well and the Minister is very supportive of the project and the site selection process.

This meeting identified approaches through which the SSC could meet with the relevant Federal Minister(s).

Brad Flaherty noted that the Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA) regulates the price of water in South Australia and is independent to SA Water and cabinet. Brad also noted that SA Water can apply through ESCOSA to have the funding for a project shared by SA Water’s state-wide customer base, through an increase to the cost of water supply.

Brad noted that in their meeting with the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, he and Peter emphasised two key points:

1. There is an opportunity for the State Government to create a positive outcome for the community by securing Eyre Peninsula’s drinking water supply past 2025
2. Economic development in the western part of South Australia has been restricted by limited access to water and Eyre Peninsula’s water infrastructure needs to be upgraded to allow for population increase and economic development.

Brad noted that supplementary Federal funding could come from the National Water Grid Authority through a proposal sponsored by the State Government through PIRSA.

15. Next meeting and close

An agenda for the next meeting will be circulated prior to the next meeting, set for **Tuesday 26 July from 11.00am to 5.00pm**.

With no further comments, the meeting closed at 4.44pm.

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
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	Closed
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	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
9	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
10	Final Environmental Performance Criteria to be shared with the SSC.	Project Team	30/06/22	14/07/22	In progress

Appendix – Final Assessment Criteria and Weightings

Environmental	26.85%	Marine	Outfall	Proximity to State marine parks (and consideration of zoning within marine park), protected marine species and habitats and aquaculture industry, e.g., sanctuaries, protection zones	3.15%
				Potential for direct environmental impact in operation which will require further consideration	3.00%
				Potential for indirect environmental impact in operation which will require further consideration	2.47%
			Intake	Proximity to State marine parks (and consideration of zoning within marine park), protected marine species and habitats and aquaculture industry, e.g., sanctuaries, protection zones, nursery grounds	3.00%
				Potential for direct environmental impact in operation which will require further consideration	2.73%
				Potential for indirect environmental impact in operation which will require further consideration	2.32%
		Land	Impact to flora and fauna	Proximity to National and State parks, protected National and State species and habitats and other protected zones (such as water protection zones)	2.21%
			Native vegetation	Significance of native vegetation on site and pipeline route. Extent of native vegetation clearance and possible re-clearance for maintenance purposes required (and potential costs of clearance)	1.69%
			Visual impacts	Consideration of visual and light intrusion to nearest neighbours and other user groups both during construction and operations	1.84%
			Noise	Consideration of noise and vibration impacts to fauna both during construction and operations	2.06%
			Surface and groundwater	Proximity and risk to existing surface and groundwater resources (including critical water supplies) both during construction and operations	2.40%

Social and Community	24.69%	Community	Tourism	Proximity to Tourism precincts, including township, recreational fishing areas, nature-based tourist spots	1.83%
			Recreational fishing	Extent to which recreational fishing may be affected	2.03%
			Amenity value	Extent to which building design blends with existing landscape and minimises visual amenity and noise issues to neighbours	1.69%
				Extent to which accessibility to coastal areas is maintained or enhanced and connectivity to landscape is managed	1.66%
			Traffic	Extent to which traffic may affect site neighbors, access points and adjoining road corridors	0.93%
		Community/Business	Capacity	Extent to which growth within the customer base network can be accommodated	2.79%
		Business	Business/Commercial	Extent to which either real or perceived direct or indirect environmental impact may have quantifiable commercial consequences for the fishing and aquaculture industry	3.17%
				Extent to which either real or perceived direct or indirect environmental impact may have quantifiable commercial consequences for SA Water	1.69%
		Customer	Water Quality	Minimise impacts to water quality, improved water quality to customers	2.83%
			Water Security	Extent to which water security is delivered to all customers	3.21%
		Heritage	Aboriginal heritage	Minimise impact to areas of Aboriginal heritage significance and native title	2.03%
			European heritage	Minimise impact to areas of European heritage significance	0.83%

Technical	13.27%	Operations	Operational Maintenance	Access and working space to transfer main and plant, distances to underground services, traffic and repair complexities and response times	0.85%
				Access to outfall and intakes and ability to maintain	1.09%
				Suitability of vehicle access for continued operations	0.73%
		Construction	Marine Environment	Potential for direct environmental impact in construction of outfall and intake which will require further consideration (construction method will influence impact potential)	1.22%
				Potential for indirect environmental impact in construction of outfall and intake which will require further consideration (construction method will influence impact potential)	1.09%
			Ocean construction complexity	Ease of construction – access, conditions	1.17%
			Land construction complexity	Ease of Construction – access, laydown, geotechnical conditions, proximity to existing road/ power/ water	0.97%
			Road maintenance	Extent of maintenance required for access roads during and post construction	0.63%
			Lead times/ construction program	Program risk associated with works	0.83%
		Systems	System/ Network integration	Resilience providing operational capacity and supply reliability	1.32%
			Water Quality management	Minimise impacts to water quality, improved water quality to customers	1.32%
		Asset	Accessibility	Ability to access assets and defend against bush fire	0.98%
			Safety	Ability for maintenance staff to safely access assets for maintenance	1.07%

Property	11.73%	Property	Land availability/ access	Access and working space to main and plant, distances to underground services, traffic and repair complexities and response times	3.36%
			Land	Land profile, zoning (land use change)	1.55%
			Easements	Easement procurement for transfer main / intake and outfall pipes	2.05%
			Amenity value	Does not detract from surrounding landscape and property values	2.36%
			Accessibility	Access able to accommodate large vehicles, deliveries etc.	2.41%

Financial	23.46%	Financial	Net Present Value	Net Present Value	7.49%
			Construction	Cost of construction	7.49%
			Funding	Funding model is available and to support project	8.48%