

Meeting Title: EP Desal Project – Site Selection Committee Meeting 08

Project Name: Eyre Peninsula Desalination Plant Project

Meeting Purpose: To provide an update on project activities

Date: Tuesday 7 June 2022

Time: 2.00pm – 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

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	Apology	Kirsten Rough
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	
Delfina Lanzilli	Chief Executive, District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula	Yes	
Gary Neave	Independent Project Director, TSA	Yes	
Hannah Allen-Jordan	Acting Mayor, District Council of Tumby Bay	Apology	
Jack Ritchie	Member, Port Lincoln Chamber of Commerce and Tourism	Apology	
Jo-Anne Quigley	Mayor, District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula	Yes	
Jonathan Clark	General Manager, Eyre Peninsula Landscape Board	Apology	Susan Stovell (online)
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	Apology	
Shane Hodgins	Director, RecFish SA	Apology	
Thomas McNab	President, Abalone Industry Association of South Australia Inc	Yes	
Tom Hyde	Member, Australian Abalone Growers Association	Yes	

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 provide summary information gathered to date on the four shortlisted sites
- Update the SSC on the Funding Sub Committee deliberations
- Review site assessment criteria
- Seek buy in for meeting schedule to end of July
- Confirm Environmental Performance Criteria for design to be reviewed by the Marine Scientific Review Committee
- Further update the SSC on the community engagement work that has been undertaken
- Update the SCC on recent media activity.

2. Apologies and proxies

Brian Jeffriess was noted as an apology, with Kirsten Rough attending as a proxy.

Jonathan Clark was noted as an apology, with Susan Stovell attending as a proxy.

Clare McLaughlin was noted as an apology.

Hannah Allen-Jordan was noted as an apology.

Jack Ritchie was noted as an apology.

Sam Telfer was noted as an apology.

Shane Hodgins 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 7 held on 19/05/2022 were accepted.

4.1 Matters arising

The Chair noted that the Marine Scientific Review Committee (MSRC) was discussed at length at Meeting 7, and the MSRC is due to meet on Friday 10 June. The Chair noted that from the community engagement conducted, he understands that the MSRC adds even more credibility to the site selection process.

The Chair noted that the Funding Sub Committee (FSC) had its first meeting and that Brad Flaherty will chair the FSC.

5. Action items of previous meetings

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

6. Project activity update since last meeting

Steve noted that the information to be presented on the four shortlisted sites is a work in progress and that a great deal of work is being done in the background to complete a more comprehensive document around the start of July. This document will assist the SSC in the site assessment process.

6.1 Site planning

Steve noted the key activities since the last meeting:

- Formation of the Funding Sub Committee
- Site tour with District Council of Lower Eyre, Member for Flinders and SSC Chair
- Lessons for the future (Project Team discussion)
- Introduced to the SAW Board the pathway following receipt of the SSC recommendation
- SAW Endorsement for the team to control design up to the point of detailed design
- MSRC inaugural meeting Friday 10 June
- Additional production and monitoring bores being placed at Uley South to be completed in June to sustain supply until 2025
- Network configuration being considered (particularly in relation to Point Boston)
- Iron Knob to Kimba pipeline reversal is being brought back into the scope of this project for further development – of strong community interest for SSC discussion post site selection.

An SSC member questioned how the proposed hydrogen hub at Whyalla would be considered regarding the network configuration.

Gary noted that desalinated water won't be supplied from the south to the hydrogen hub, and it isn't a consideration for this project.

6.2 Confirmation of plant configurations for design team

Uley South Shoal Point

Gary shared a plan of the plant configuration that the project team engineers believe is most achievable at Uley South Shoal Point, which would have the plant located inland from the cliffs with a tunnel bored directly out to the sea for the intake and outlet pipes. Gary also noted that this configuration would require a large piece of equipment in the sea to build a structure for the intake and outlet pipes – with the high level of energy at this location, there are only certain times that this work can be done and workers would likely need to be helicoptered out to a platform.

An SSC member asked how long the tunnel from the desalination plant to the coast would be.

Steve noted that the proposed layout sites the desalination plant approximately 1.3km from the coast.

Steve noted that the other layout option previously discussed, which involved building the intake and outlet pipes following existing tracks to the southern end of Gunyah Beach, would require approximately 5km of pipeline from plant to coast and the project team engineers have ruled this layout option out due to cost.

Gary noted that this layout option would also have required 22 hectares of native vegetation clearance.

Gary noted that the idea of cliff top bores to the saline aquifer is still under consideration, but it would be a challenge to achieve the required approvals for that configuration with the short timeframe from the

project. Gary also noted that if Uley South Shoal Point is selected as the preferred site, cliff top bores could be considered in the future to increase the capacity of the desalination plant.

An SSC member questioned the distance from the plant to power infrastructure in the proposed configuration, as well as how it would connect into the SA Water network.

Gary noted that the proposed plant location is not far from the borefield and that the existing power infrastructure would be supplemented and extended. Gary also noted that SA Water is investigating connection into the existing pipeline that services the borefield, and that this would require either a small supplementary pipeline or replacing the existing larger pipeline.

Steve noted that specific distances for transfer mains and power will be in the comprehensive document that will be available in July.

Sleaford North

Steve noted:

- The innovative subsurface intake option in Proper Bay with discharge at Sleaford North is presenting issues with regards to ongoing maintenance associated with the extended discharge pipeline
- On hold pending outcome of site selection process
- Engineering challenges due to length of intake and outlet
- Aware of community concerns on visible amenity on coastline
- Any ideas for alternative location.

Steve shared a plan of the proposed plant configuration at Sleaford North, which would have the plant located inland in lower lying land. Steve noted that this configuration responds to the community's preferences around noise and visual amenity near the coastline.

Gary noted that the engineering team's ideal configuration would site the desalination plant closer to the coast with shorter intake and outlet pipes – the proposed configuration that Steve has shared does present some engineering challenges that would have cost implications.

An SSC member questioned whether visual amenity is the main community concern being addressed by locating the plant inland.

Steve noted that the proposed configuration locates the plant inland on the basis of visual amenity and noise amenity.

An SSC member noted that vegetation can be very effective for visual screening and noise attenuation.

An SSC member questioned whether the proposed configuration includes a wet well.

Gary noted that the engineering team are looking at a wet well, as they are for the other shortlisted sites, with a pumpstation next to, or within it.

An SSC member asked where the wet well would be located in this configuration at Sleaford North.

Gary noted that this aspect hasn't been designed yet but pointed to an area on the coast west of Lone Pine Beach that is being considered as a possible location for the wet well.

An SSC member asked if locating the wet well right on the coast presented a safety issue.

Steve noted that all of the shortlisted sites would have significant safety considerations that would need to be addressed in design. Steve also noted that none of the shortlisted sites have an ideal configuration – there are always trade-offs.

Steve asked the SSC what else they need to know about Sleaford North and whether there is merit in the project team looking at the option of locating the plant closer to the coast.

An SSC member noted that horizontal photos of the location would be useful to give the SSC a greater appreciation of the terrain and vista.

An SSC member questioned what marine considerations are present at Sleaford North.

Steve noted that the biggest marine environment consideration is the presence of whales.

An SSC member noted that there is also abalone present at Sleaford North, near Lone Pine Lookout.

Gary noted that the high wave energy at Sleaford North, Sleaford West and Uley South Shoal Point will adequately disperse the saline discharge. The science and data will need to verify this assumption, but we don't anticipate dispersion or accumulation to be a concern at any of those sites.

The Chair noted that it will be essential to have a solid understanding of the areas of importance from an Aboriginal heritage perspective before the SSC makes a decision on a preferred site to recommend to SA Water and the Government.

Steve noted that there is a fairly detailed report that is currently being considered, but there won't be enough time for a full heritage survey before the end of July. Steve noted that the intention is for a site walkover to take place with Traditional Owners to get an indication of any potential obstacles.

An SSC member questioned the cost difference at Sleaford North of locating the plant inland and locating the plant near the coast – if it is a relatively small difference then locating the plant inland would make sense, but if a large cost saving could be achieved by locating the plant closer to the coast, then that should be considered.

An SSC member questioned how operational costs will impact the total cost of each shortlisted site, and how that will be considered in the site selection process.

Gary noted that there will be a model that considers the overall cost and not just capital expenditure.

Steve noted that the intention is to provide the SSC with comparative analysis of the total expenditure, including capital expenditure and operational expenditure.

An SSC member noted that of the four shortlisted sites, Sleaford North presents the greatest opportunity around reconciliation with Traditional Owners.

An SSC member asked what the local community's preference is regarding how far inland the plant should be located.

Steve noted that there isn't a specific distance, but the preference is for the plant to not be visible from the coast.

An SSC member asked how many houses would be visually impacted at Sleaford North.

Steve noted that there are approximately 25 local residents who would either be directly visually impacted or feel strongly about the amenity of the location, along with the many visitors to the site.

Steve noted that another briefing session could be held with the Sleaford community to better understand their expectations and preferences.

The Chair noted that a site tour of the four shortlisted sites could be arranged for SSC members to get a better understanding of some of the physical considerations at each location.

An SSC member noted that it is important for the SSC to understand the height and size of the desalination plant and the visual impact it would have on the landscape.

Steve noted that the project team could prepare a visual representation of the desalination plant and pumping station at each of the four shortlisted sites to give the SSC an idea of the scale of what would be constructed.

An SSC member noted that while the SSC needs to consider visual amenity concerns, it is important to recognise that it isn't possible to solve every problem at each site.

Sleaford West

Gary shared a plan of the proposed plant configuration at the southern end of Sleaford West, with the plant located close to the coast and the intake and outlet entering the ocean at Echo Beach.

Gary noted that there is an ecotourism venture near to Echo Beach, the implications of which need to be explored with the business owner and landholder. Gary also noted the presence of abalone near Echo Beach and again suggested that the high wave energy is anticipated to be sufficient to disperse the saline discharge.

Gary shared an alternative plant configuration that would site the plant further away from the ecotourism venture, with longer intake and outlet pipes entering the ocean at Echo Beach. Gary noted that this option may resolve the ecotourism impact but poses challenges with the length of the intake and outlet pipes.

An SSC member questioned where the wet well would be located at Sleaford West and noted potential constructability issues.

Gary noted that the wet well would be built behind the sand dunes, with a construction framework like a cofferdam to work in.

Steve noted that all of the sites pose construction challenges.

An SSC member noted that the roads that would service heavy vehicles during construction are not of a high standard.

Steve noted that this point is addressed in the assessment criteria and will be discussed in agenda item 8.

Point Boston

Gary shared a plan of the proposed plant configuration at Point Boston with the plant located away from the residential development, and the intake and outlet pipes primarily following the road corridor and entering the ocean north of the residential development.

Gary noted that visual amenity concerns would be adequately addressed with this configuration, that there is existing industrial presence at this location, and the presence of ponds could present an opportunity around backflush and recovery not present at other sites.

Gary noted that the ability for the intake and outlet pipes to follow the road corridor reduces the amount of native vegetation clearance required.

Gary noted that there are some challenges at Point Boston to do with aquaculture industry concerns. Hydrodynamic modelling is underway, with the introduction of further monitoring points at Point Boston. Dispersion and accumulation are to be considered following the verification of the model. Particle tracking will be extended to provide line of sight to possible response to an intake at this location.

Gary noted that the length of the pipeline at Point Boston does pose a challenge but is viable.

Gary noted that the plant location in the proposed configuration was selected due to land availability, presence of existing industry and infrastructure, and opportunity for revegetation.

An SSC member questioned whether the subsurface intake concept could be applied to Point Boston.

Gary noted that a subsurface intake could potentially be viable at Point Boston and would be considered if this site is selected; and the science suggests a benefit.

An SSC member noted that of the four shortlisted sites, Point Boston is the most concerning for the aquaculture industry in terms of the location of the outlet and discharge.

Steve noted that the hydrodynamic modelling currently being undertaken will be important in addressing this concern.

An SSC member noted that to be consistent with how the aquaculture industry is required to operate, the intake and outlet would have to be further out.

Steve noted that his understanding is that this boundary is around the 4km mark.

An SSC member noted that the boundary is basically a line from Point Bolingbroke to Cape Donington.

Gary noted that work is being undertaken to understand how saline discharge behaves as compared to nutrients from the aquaculture industry, noting that behaviour and impacts are quite different.

An SSC member noted that the worst-case scenario needs to be considered, not just the everyday scenario.

Gary noted that if Point Boston was to be selected as the preferred site, the science and data would guide the engineering solution for the intake and outlet. The independent Marine Scientific Review

Committee would review the hydrodynamic modelling and whether the design of the intake and outlet represents a reasonable design response.

An SSC member questioned the parameters of the hydrodynamic modelling and whether it is being done across the whole year.

Gary noted the model is the same model that PIRSA use, and there is close to 12 months of data at Boston Bay. Gary noted that the project team is now collecting supplementary data to determine to what degree the Point Boston site is different to Billy Lights Point in this regard.

7. Funding Sub Committee update

Brad Flaherty noted that he was nominated as the chair of the Funding Sub Committee (FSC) by the other members.

Brad noted that the FSC had a constructive first meeting on 30 May.

Actions for the FSC from Meeting 1 are as follows:

- One page summary to communicate key messages of funding requirements (elevator pitch).
- Engage an additional resource to assist with the review and reframing of the business case, ensuring it contains a public narrative.
- Brief Minister for Environment and Water.
- Consider meeting/briefing of Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development.
- Once Federal Ministry is settled, identify avenue to present case to the Minister for Regions and identify possible funding options/grants.

Brad noted that the FSC will have its second meeting on Tuesday 14 June.

8. Review of assessment criteria for final site selection

Steve noted that Infrastructure Australia's suggested approach to optioneering and defining a preferred option for infrastructure provision and delivery will be followed, albeit with some minor modifications:

1. Defining problems and opportunities
2. Identifying and analysing options
 - Assessment process using criteria linked to a scoring methodology to filter a longlist output from the strategic assessment to a filtered list.
3. Developing a business case
4. Post completion review.

Steve noted that the draft assessment criteria was distributed to the SSC for review and input, with several pieces of feedback received.

Steve noted that the assessment criteria would need to be finalised by the next meeting on 30 June and asked the SSC for any further thoughts.

Steve presented the updated draft assessment criteria and noted the revisions made.

An SSC member noted that the intention behind changing the wording for the marine criteria to include "direct and indirect environmental and commercial impacts" was to account for a hypothetical scenario where the desalination plant directly negatively impacts the marine environment (e.g., hypersaline water killing seaweed), which then has an indirect commercial impact on the aquaculture industry.

Following further discussion about how best to address this point, Steve noted that the assessment criteria would be amended in line with the discussion, to address the points made.

An SSC member noted that there needs to be consideration of the types of roads that would be used to access a given site during construction, and the impact that construction traffic would have on these roads – it would be unfair for the District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula to bear the cost of having to

grade impacted roads more frequently during construction than they otherwise would. It is important to understand what the cost is of maintaining impacted roads and making good at the end of construction.

Following further discussion about how best to address this point, Steve noted that the assessment criteria would be amended in line with the discussion, to address the points made.

Steve noted several processes for applying weighting to the agreed upon assessment criteria, and that this would be addressed at the next meeting.

An SSC member noted that they have encountered issues with showstoppers in scoring systems like this in the past.

Gary noted that the process will account for this, and thresholds can be set for potential showstoppers.

9. Committee process to end of July

Discussion deferred and relevant presentation slides will be distributed to the SSC post-meeting.

10. Marine Scientific Review Committee update

Steve noted that Dr Don Plowman (MSRC Chair) will attend the next meeting. Steve also noted that the Environmental Performance Criteria that the independent MSRC will review will be distributed to the SSC post-meeting.

11. Community engagement feedback

Steve noted that the community is engaged with the project:

- Water Talks project page received 952 visits (from the announcement of the four shortlisted sites to 31 May)
- Documents were downloaded 289 times, mostly the minutes of the SSC meetings
- 129,000 Facebook impressions (how many times online survey post was seen)
- Considering it was a target post to EP region (35K people), the post was seen on average 4 times
- 36 comments
- Community engagement survey – 27 April to 31 May:
 - 215 responses
 - 68% completion rate.

12. Media update

The Chair noted that several media releases have been distributed to the local media following recent meetings, and reminded the SSC that all media contact would remain through the Chair.

13. Other business

Steve noted that in order for the key activities of weighting the assessment criteria and scoring to be effective, all SSC members will need to be present on 30 June and 28 July as a minimum.

14. Next meeting and close

An agenda for the next meeting will be circulated prior to the next meeting, set for **Thursday 30 June from 11.00am to 5.00pm**.

With no further comments, the meeting closed at 5.12pm.

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 Scientific Review Committee (MSRC) to review the Environmental Performance Criteria and pass comment to the design team. MSRC comments on the Environmental Performance Criteria to be shared with SSC.	MSRC	19/05/22	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	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