

Meeting Title: EP Desal Project – Site Selection Committee Meeting 16

Project Name: Eyre Peninsula Desalination Plant Project

Meeting Purpose: Marine science presentation

Date: Friday 10 February 2023

Time: 10.00am – 12.00pm

Location: Port Lincoln Hotel

Attendance:

Name	Role	Present
Peter Treloar	Chair	Yes
Steve Dangerfield	Engagement Facilitator	Yes
Jemma Silvester	Community Engagement	Yes
Isaac Glonek	Minute Taker	Yes
Hazel Austin	Project Manager	Yes (online)
Nancy Nguyen	Assistant Project Manager	Yes
Shaun Ambrose	District Leader, SA Water	Yes
Dr Don Plowman	Chair, Independent Marine Science Review Panel	Yes
Dr Hazel Vandeleur	Senior Env Impact Assessment Officer, SA Water	Yes
Dr Mark Doubell	Oceanography Sub-program Leader, South Australian Research and Development Institute	Yes
Dr Charles James	Oceanographer, South Australian Research and Development Institute	Yes
Tara Hage	Senior Manager Environmental Social Governance, SA Water	Yes

Committee:

SSC Member	Role	Present	Proxy
Andy Dyer	President, SA Mussel Growers Association	Yes	
Brian Jeffriess	Chief Executive, Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association Ltd	Yes	
Bryan Trigg	Chair, Regional Development Australia Eyre Peninsula	Yes	
Claire Webber	Executive Officer, South Australian Sardine Industry Association Inc.	Yes	
Dean Johnson	President, Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association	Apology	
Delfina Lanzilli	Chief Executive, District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula	Yes	
Diana Mislov	Mayor, City of Port Lincoln Council	Yes	
Gary Neave	Independent Project Director, TSA	Apology	
Geoff Churchett	Mayor, District Council of Tumby Bay	Apology	
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	
Matthew Morgan	Chief Executive, City of Port Lincoln Council	Yes	
Peter Scott	Executive Officer, Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association	Apology	
Rebecca Hayes	Chief Executive, District Council of Tumby Bay	Apology	

Rob Gratton	Chief Executive, Clean Seas Seafood Limited	Yes	
Ryan Viney	Chief Executive, Regional Development Australia Eyre Peninsula	Apology	
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 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:

- Report back on the marine science research undertaken in Boston and Proper Bays, carried out in parallel to the site selection review process
- Present the key themes and outcomes of the SARDI oceanographic monitoring and far-field modelling report
- Present the MSRP's perspective on the SARDI oceanographic monitoring and far-field modelling report, the habitat mapping report and the ecotoxicity review report
- Describe how the next phases will build on these investigations
- Update on the recommendation to Government
- Formally bring the activities of the Site Selection Committee to a close.

2. Apologies and proxies

Dean Johnson was noted as an apology.

Gary Neave was noted as an apology.

Geoff Churchett was noted as an apology.

Peter Scott was noted as an apology.

Rebecca Hayes was noted as an apology.

Ryan Viney 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 that he had recently been appointed Chair of the Eyre Peninsula Landscape Board.

The Chair noted that he has also been asked to Chair the Upper Spencer Gulf Sustainable Development Forum.

4. Minutes of previous meetings 14 and 15

The minutes of Meeting 14 held on 09/11/2022 were accepted.

The minutes of Meeting 15 held on 19/12/2022 were accepted.

5. Business arising

Nil noted.

6. Action items of previous meetings

The Chair noted that Action Item #1 has been deferred to when a site is selected and can therefore be considered closed by the SSC.

The Chair noted that Action Item #2 has been actioned and can therefore be closed.

The Chair noted that Action Item #3 has been deferred to when a site is selected and can therefore be considered closed by the SSC.

7. Baseline marine science investigation reports – context

Steve thanked the SSC for reviewing the various marine science reports and noted that several members had submitted questions regarding those reports.

Steve noted that, as of 10 February, the State Government and SA Water have not made a decision on the site for the desalination plant.

Steve noted that the former Minister's brief from November 2021 stated:

An increase in groundwater levels in Uley South Basin means “we can put the desalination plant project on hold for 12 months while further scientific investigations and more engagement with the community is undertaken.”

“SA Water has already undertaken extensive scientific analysis and site reviews, but the pause allows for additional baseline monitoring and more detailed assessments to be provided on this site and alternative sites.”

Steve noted that the SSC process has included thorough engagement with the community to undertake detailed assessment on other sites.

Steve noted that additional baseline monitoring and scientific investigations have been conducted for SA Water's preferred site near Billy Lights Point.

Steve noted the key decision factors that will be considered by SA Water and the State Government's in determining a site for the desalination plant:

- Water security and timeline for delivery
- Project risk
- The structure of the network
- Funding
- ISA's plans with respect to a northern water solution
- Marine science outcomes and recommendations

To provide context about the current situation, Steve noted:

- No new sites were identified
- The selection of a site is complex
- All sites considered have issues to be managed
- The SSC has identified and recommended its preferred site – the project team supported by SA Water has spent the last six months thoroughly investigating the SSC's preferred site at Sleaford to identify a way forward at that location

- Similarly, in line with the activity brief, further scientific investigations have continued in Boston and Proper Bays to understand what would need to be managed and mitigated for the base case site – i.e., can the bay system support a desalination plant
- All information to do with the SSC's preferred site and the base case (including estimated costs) has been, and is being, conveyed to the SA Water Board and State Government for their consideration
- Information relating to the SSC's preferred site and the base case has been shared with the SSC – this includes the commitment to share the outcomes of the baseline marine science investigations to do with the base case
- The marine science reports are preliminary assessments and have been distributed to SSC members (and some nominated stakeholders)
- Today is an opportunity for the authors to speak to those reports and for the views of the MSRP to be presented
- The investigations that have occurred both in the bays (marine science) and at Sleaford (heritage, engineering, flora, geology) are intended to provide information to assist in the site location decision
- If the base case was to be selected by Government, then these baseline reports will become key inputs to inform actual project design decisions and approvals processes
- The MSRP was convened to review the baseline reports and pass comment on the technical content, and to advise the SSC to assist in their decision-making
- SSC members have reviewed the baseline monitoring reports and today's presentations will aim to address some of the questions raised, with opportunity for discussion.

An SSC member asked whether written responses could be provided to the marine science questions submitted by SSC members.

Steve took this question on notice and noted that the request would be considered outside of the SSC.

8. MSRP perspective

Dr Don Plowman reminded the SSC of the membership of the independent Marine Science Review Panel:

- Dr Don Plowman – Former Deputy Chief Executive of Primary Industries and Regions and Former Director of Research, SA Research and Development Institute
- Dr Ian Wallis – Environmental engineer with extensive experience with desalination plant site selection and operations
- Dr John Luick – Oceanography and modelling, formerly with SARDI and currently a consultant
- Professor Sean Connell – Environmental Scientist and Marine Ecologist, University of Adelaide
- Dr Anu Kumar – Environmental toxicologist and environmental risk assessment, CSIRO
- Dr Alistair Hobday – Spatial management and migration of pelagic species and marine environmental impacts, Research Director, CSIRO

Dr Don Plowman noted that the MSRP's role had two parts:

1. To advise the SSC on some of the issues that needed to be taken into account in recommending a site
2. To review detailed marine science information once a site is selected and to pass comment on placement and design of the intake and outfall structures.

Dr Don Plowman noted that the oceanographic monitoring and far-field modelling report will be covered in detail by the SARDI scientists.

Dr Don Plowman noted that the MSRP are confident in the findings of the reports:

- Validation of the model for within the bays
- The MSRP are confident that 12 months of validation modelling of the existing, proven model, is sufficient to inform the decision-making process for site selection
- Anomaly of 0.44 PSU within 250 to 500 metres of the outfall – this is well within the natural variability of salinity in the bays and standards required to be met by the plant
- Entrainment and entrapment of particles concluded that <0.1% of spawned biomass would be likely to cross a 25-metre radius of the intake pipe
- These impacts are expected to be further reduced with detailed location and construction of the intake and outfall pipes.

Dr Don Plowman noted that all of the parameters used in the modelling were conservative – including the size of the desalination plant (12 GL/year, based on the ultimate capacity of 8 GL/year working 24/7), and injecting the discharge into only a single bottom layer rather than multiple levels.

The MSRP are confident that the minor impacts of the desalination plant can be sufficiently managed and mitigated through adequate design of the intake and outfall locations, and the outfall diffuser system.

Dr Don Plowman noted that the MSRP will review further monitoring and modelling if the State Government selects a site for the desalination plant in the bays surround Port Lincoln.

Regarding the habitat mapping report, the MSRP noted the following:

- The SA Water Environmental Performance Criteria requires minimisation of impacts upon marine flora, fauna, and habitats during all stages of development – the habitat mapping report should be included in decision making around the location of the intake and outfall pipelines if a site is selected at Billy Lights Point or Point Boston
- Until SA Water have a project site and a construction methodology, the Panel have no oversight for how much of a footprint and consequent impact on the marine environment the intake and outfall pipes may have
- Any removal of (or impact on) seagrass will have a required calculation and inclusion within a Native Vegetation Clearance application (under the Native Vegetation Act 1991) submitted separately from and discussed within the Development Application. Key to the Native Vegetation Clearance application will be the requirement to demonstrate the mitigation hierarchy.

Regarding the ecotoxicity review report, the MSRP noted the following advice:

- In relation to the potential impacts from the chemicals used for antiscaling and membrane cleaning, the finding of the ecotoxicity review report was that there would be no appreciable negative impact on the marine environment from these substances provided that dilution ratios calculated for each chemical tested previously are met and that appropriate management procedures are followed
- This was based on the small amounts of chemical used and the low toxicity of the chemicals once they had been neutralised before discharge
- This advice was supported by Panel members with experience in management of plants similar to the proposed plant and the body of information in the published literature.

Dr Don Plowman noted that the conclusion from the ecotoxicity data review is that 40:1 dilution is more than adequate to minimise any adverse impacts from the discharge of the plant.

Dr Don Plowman noted that the ecotoxicity review report recommended further work on the impact of brine on mussel larvae. This work will only be undertaken if a site within the Boston and Proper Bay system is selected.

Regarding the oceanographic monitoring and far-field modelling report produced by SARDI, the MSRP noted:

- Results provided within the SARDI oceanographic modelling report show the far-field salinity levels within the ANZECC limits. It is important to note that the preliminary assessment assumed

all brine was expelled from one port (i.e., a single grid cell) in the bottom layer of the model. It is therefore a worst-case scenario as it is expected that a multi-port diffuser will be used in practice to discharge the saline water

- Subsequent modelling shows the reduced impact when the saline water is expelled into more than one layer – more closely representing the actual situation
- A further observation from the SARDI modelling was that the natural seasonal variation in salinity within the bays was greater than the variation in salinity as a consequence of the saline water release and dispersion from the plant.

The Chair asked how the SSC can have confidence in the validity of SARDI's modelling.

Dr Mark Doubell noted that the report provides a detailed validation against the collected data streams. Further, there is a history of development of models, with increasing resolution to resolve dynamics at smaller and smaller spatial scales. The South Australian Regional Ocean Models are used by the Bureau of Meteorology and Department of Defence – those organisations have confidence in the models.

An SSC member asked if there is a risk that the 12 months of validation data, given that it was collected in the third year of a La Niña cycle with wetter and windier weather patterns than usual, is not an accurate representation of the bay system.

Dr Mark Doubell noted that as a scientist, the first thought is always 'the more data, the better'. The longer the data streams are compared with the models, the greater the confidence in the models.

Dr Charles James noted that for modelling, every year is special in its own way. Any time there are observations you can use to validate against the model, you look at the model and can assess how accurate it was. If the model can be validated for this year, it provides greater confidence that the model is accurate for other years.

An SSC member asked if an extended outfall would be the best option for a desalination plant in the bay system.

Dr Mark Doubell noted that when several sites are modelled in the way that they have been for this project, it is natural and simple to rank them. Consistent with all of the other modelling and advice that SARDI provides (including to the aquaculture industry), if a discharge source of any sort is going to be located in the area, then further offshore will provide improved flushing. In terms of the salinity anomaly produced by modelling the various sites, the differences are minor and all sites are below the recommended levels in the literature and guidelines.

Dr Don Plowman noted that the MSRP initially requested modelling for three sites with a single discharge point. The modelling for the extended outfalls clearly showed that the location of the outfall impacts the salinity anomaly produced. Modelling was also prepared for the various sites with the outfall being injected into three layers instead of one – in practice the discharge would likely be into at least three layers – and the impact on the salinity anomalies produced were appreciable. The MSRP's recommendation is that detailed work be carried out to determine the exact siting of the intake and outfall if a desalination plant is to be located within the bay system. The minimisation of any long-term impacts would be assessed through the development application and approvals process, and also be a key part of the ongoing monitoring requirements when the plant is in operation.

An SSC member questioned the validity of the mussel larval modelling, noting that they disagreed with the assumptions used for the modelling. The variables of mussel spawning, including location, size and timeframe, are unknown.

Dr Mark Doubell noted that the assumptions for larval modelling were stated in the report and were developed in consultation with the industry. Apart from the general span of the spawning period, there are unknowns, so literature regarding similar species was considered.

Dr Don Plowman noted that the report states 0.1% of mussel spat could come within a 25-metre zone of the intake pipe, and that even if there were significant errors with the assumptions used, the likely impact would be extremely minor. The desalination experts on the MSRP are very confident that this would not be an issue with a suitably designed and located intake structure.

An SSC member questioned what the confidence interval is for the estimate of 0.1% of mussel spat potentially coming within a 25m zone of the intake structure.

Dr Mark Doubell noted that there is variability shown in the report for the monthly connectivity.

An SSC member questioned how reliable the modelling is, given that it relies on the literature, but there is no information about a major industry in proximity to a desalination plant intake in the relevant literature.

Dr Don Plowman noted that the MSRP members with significant experience in this area are confident that the risk of impact upon the industry from entrainment of mussel spat is minimal.

9. SARDI reports and outcomes

Dr Mark Doubell thanked the SSC and MSRP for reviewing the reports and providing questions/comments.

To provide a background on SARDI's work, and its objectives, Dr Mark Doubell noted:

- SA Water plans to build a desalination plant to supply 5.3-8 GL of freshwater per year
- Considering value of surrounding aquaculture zone and reduced flushing of embayments relative to offshore waters (Herzfeld et al., 2008 and Middleton et al., 2013, 2014), there are concerns regarding desalination impacts:
 - the disposal of desalination brine on the receiving marine ecosystem
 - the entrainment of eggs and larvae of marine organisms, such as blue mussels, by the intake
- Existing models developed by SARDI were refined and validated for the region
- Applied to understand the far-field (hundreds of meters to tens of km) impact of proposed outfalls and intakes
- An ultra-conservative approach was taken by modelling brine outfalls equivalent to a 12 GL/year plant operating at maximum capacity
- Far-field transport of planktonic (mussel) larvae was completed over multiple years to understand far-field connectivity with proposed intakes.

Dr Mark Doubell noted that SARDI were not starting from scratch on their modelling and that various work has been taking place in the Spencer Gulf since 2008.

With respect to development of the High-Resolution Boston Bay Model, Dr Mark Doubell noted:

- Models forced with pressure, wind, humidity, heat-fluxes, precipitation and tides
- Compared against moored field observations at 3 sites
- Model improvements include:
 - Nesting in the Two Gulfs Model
 - Bathymetry (Australian Hydrographic Office)
 - Correction for localised heat-fluxes using satellite sea surface temperature.

Dr Mark Doubell presented animations of the saline discharge modelling at several sites within the bay system.

Regarding these animations, Dr Mark Doubell noted that these represent the discharge from a 12 GL/year plant (i.e., an 8 GL/year plant operating 24/7, which will not happen) with the saline water being discharged into the bottom layer of the model.

Dr Mark Doubell presented comparisons of the salinity in the bay without a desalination plant and salinity in the bay with a desalination plant, with the difference between the two being the salinity anomaly. Dr Mark Doubell also noted:

- Differences between salinity predictions with and without desalination (anomalies) are used to quantify the salinity increases over a range of spatial and temporal scales

- Maps of the seasonally-averaged maximum salinity anomaly combine the variations in plume transport modelled over 5 years to predict the 'footprint' of salinity increases.

An SSC member noted that over a three-day period, there would be 12 tides and a series of varying weather conditions. For a point 1km away from the discharge, the average over three days might not seem very high, but on a shorter timescale the anomaly could be significantly higher.

Dr Mark Doubell noted that seasonal averages are used to look at long-term processes, accumulation, and the spatial extent of salinity changes. The model can also provide outputs at shorter timescales, such as hourly, to show what the maximum changes are.

Dr Mark Doubell noted that in the model, salinity increases were reduced when outfalls were in better flushed (offshore) waters east of Boston Island. However, the concentration of salinity anomalies for all sites modelled are very small – with a maximum seasonally averaged salinity increase of 0.6 PSU. Anomalies rapidly declined to less than 0.1 PSU (less than a 0.3% change in ambient salinity) within 1 km of any of the modelled outfalls.

Dr Mark Doubell noted that hourly anomalies indicate the maximum salinity increases expected over shorter timescales. At a site near to the Billy Lights Point outfall location, the maximum anomalies are generally 0.2 PSU or less, with a mean anomaly across the year of 0.035 PSU.

Regarding the hourly anomalies, Dr Mark Doubell noted two key features:

1. We get an understanding of what the maximum salinity increases are at shorter timescales
2. We can see that there is no long-term increasing trend in the salinity anomalies, that is, there is no long-term accumulation.

Dr Mark Doubell noted that only small changes in anomalies were predicted by the model due to tides, and that hourly salinity anomalies at distances of approximately 250 metres from the outfalls were always less than 0.9 PSU.

A summary of the major findings from the saline discharge modelling was provided:

- For all outfall locations, salinity increases predicted for a 12 GL/year plant operating at full capacity were small:
 - Less than 0.9 PSU (less than 2.5% change in ambient salinity) within approximately 250m of outfalls at hourly timescales
 - Less than 0.1 PSU (less than 0.3% change in ambient salinity) at distances more than 1 km from outfalls at seasonal timescales
 - Well within the natural salinity variability of the region (naturally occurring range of 1.46 PSU, approximately 4% change in ambient salinity)
 - A change of less than 5% in ambient salinity is recommended by the Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Waters
- For consideration:
 - Salinity increases were reduced when outfalls were in offshore waters east of Boston Island
 - Sufficient dilution can be achieved at all outfall locations by appropriate diffuser designs in the near-field to minimise impacts
 - Cumulative environmental impacts from anthropogenic emissions (e.g., nutrients) and climate change (marine heatwaves) were not part of this work's considerations.

With respect to the particle tracking studies, Dr Mark Doubell noted:

- Particle tracking modelling is commonly applied to understand the connectivity and recruitment of planktonic larvae
- There is limited knowledge of pelagic larval duration and development characteristics of the local blue mussel – therefore adopted biological model for blue mussels based on discussions with local mussel farmers and the scientific literature for other *Mytilus* species

- Mussel larvae were assumed to be passive and sourced from surrounding coastal intertidal zone
- For each month of the spawning season (May-September), 10 particles were released each day over five days from model grid cells within 1 km of the coast (88,350 particles per monthly spawning event), with three spawning seasons modelled
- Particles were tracked until they exited the model domain – any particles passing within a radius of 300 metres of the proposed intake were counted and removed
- The percentage of particles with connectivity to an intake pipe with a potential entrainment radius of 25 metres was estimated.

Animations were presented of the trajectory and connectivity of mussel larvae across the three spawning seasons modelled.

Dr Mark Doubell noted that:

- Connectivity patterns identified that mussels sourced from within a few kilometres of intakes had the highest connectivity with intakes
- Far-field connectivity was influenced by longer term circulation patterns (due to winds)
- Proper Bay and Boston Bay had increased connectivity with intakes located near Billy Lights Point
- Louth and Peake Bays had increased connectivity with the intake located near Point Boston

Dr Mark Doubell noted that less than 0.1% of the particles released were predicted to be entrained into an area with radius of 25 metres around the modelled intake pipe.

10. Building on investigations – next phases

Tara Hage introduced herself to the SSC, noting that she is the Senior Manager of Environmental Social Governance at SA Water and would be involved in the approvals process for the project.

Tara noted that if Government was to develop the base case (Billy Lights Point or Sleaford), the following steps would occur:

- A significant body of work has been undertaken to date to inform feasibility, siting and costings – intent and purpose to understand and identify risks and constraints, provide baseline information and key inputs to inform project decisions and design
- Next significant project phase will build on studies and baseline investigations – this will include engineering design development and detailed environmental impact assessments supported by further scientific studies and technical investigations
- The design and impact assessments will underpin the development application and will need to demonstrate that the project is able to minimise/mitigate potential impacts, including addressing recommendations made to date and the outcomes of further detailed studies/investigations
- Development application will be subject to assessment and consultation including formal review and referral processes with regulatory agencies Similar steps would be required for a site at Sleaford West but with differing inputs (whales, proximity to sanctuary zone, siting of intake and outfall and distance from coastline).

An SSC member noted that the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act will be considerably amended in coming months and it may be difficult for a desalination plant within the bay system to meet the standards required under the act.

An SSC member asked whether social licence and impacts on the local economy and industries will be considered by SA Water in its site decision.

Tara Hage noted that the site decision rests with the State Government and SA Water, and would be based on a range of factors including the outcomes of the science, community views, the value proposition, project risk and cost. Tara also noted that there will be a need for ongoing engagement with the community no matter the decision.

An SSC member asked about the timing between a site decision being made and the development application process starting, and what the process is for Cabinet to consider the SA Water Board's recommendation.

The Chair noted his understanding of the process is that SA Water will submit a paper to Cabinet for their consideration to assist in their decision-making. The Chair also noted that the decision-makers will have a lot more information now as a consequence of the work done than they did previously.

Steve noted that a number of senior staff in Government are likely to be engaged in the process. There has been a cross-government agency process in place for 12 months, and there has been a lot of work done to ensure that various Ministers are well-informed by department executives.

Tara Hage noted that the timing will, to an extent, be determined by which site is selected, and the Crown Development approval process. While it would depend on the site, generally the next phase of the project would take about 12 months.

An SSC member asked whether SA Water would be making a site recommendation in their Cabinet paper.

Tara Hage noted that SA Water will include a recommendation in their paper to Cabinet.

An SSC member questioned whether the development application will go through as a Crown development application.

Tara Hage noted that SA Water is a Crown agency so the intention is for the application to be submitted as a Crown development application.

11. Recommendation to Government

The Chair noted that:

- The Site Selection Committee has completed its work
- The Site Selection Committee has recommended its preferred site at Sleaford West
- It has been acknowledged that a funding shortfall exists and while the project would appear to be eligible to apply to the National Water Grid, a significant amount of work would be required with no guarantee of funding due to competing priorities
- Further scientific research has been undertaken in the bay system and been reviewed by the MSRP to be technically accurate and suitable for decision making in regard to site selection
- The SSC consider Sleaford West is currently the only location that delivers a social licence, with support from community leaders, the aquaculture industry, local government and the broader community.

12. Other business

Nil noted.

13. Closure of meeting and SSC

The Chair thanked the SSC for their cooperation and involvement, and the respect shown throughout the process.

With no further comments, the meeting closed at 12.40pm.

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	Closed
2	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	Closed
3	Prepare a visual representation of the desalination plant and pumping station.	Project Team	07/06/22	TBC	Closed