

Meeting Title: EP Desal Project – Site Selection Committee Meeting 07

Project Name: Eyre Peninsula Desalination Plant Project

Meeting Purpose: To update the SSC on project activities undertaken since the last meeting and provide summary information gathered to date on the four shortlisted sites

Date: Thursday 19 May 2022

Time: 3.00pm – 5.00pm

Location: Ravensdale Community Sports Centre

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 (online)
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	Apology	Peter Linn
Brian Jeffriess	Chief Executive, Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association Ltd	Yes	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	Yes (online)	
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	
Mark Whitfield	Chair, Eyre Peninsula Landscape Board	Yes	
Matthew Morgan	Chief Executive, City of Port Lincoln Council	Apology	Amanda Pearce
Peter Scott	Executive Officer, Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association	Apology	
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:

- Check in with the SSC regarding issues and opportunities and to reaffirm the role of the SSC
- 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 community engagement work that has been undertaken
- Advise the SSC on the appointment of the engineering design consultancy
- Update the SCC on the status of the Marine Scientific Review Committee (MSRC)
- Determine sub-criteria for the assessment process, and thereby confirm information that the SSC will require to make informed decisions.

2. Apologies and proxies

The Chair noted that Kirsten Rough was attending from the Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association.

Brad Flaherty was noted as an apology, with Peter Linn attending as a proxy.

Matthew Morgan was noted as an apology, with Amanda Pearce attending as a proxy.

Clare McLaughlin was noted as an apology.

Peter Scott 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 6 held on 11/04/2022 were accepted.

4.1 Matters arising

The Chair noted that in the minutes of the previous meeting, it is stated that he was “intending to meet with the new Minister for Climate, Environment and Water”. The Chair noted that he has sent an email request to the Minister’s Office to arrange a meeting.

The Chair noted that in the minutes of the previous meeting, it is stated that “there may be an opportunity for some members to form a sub-group to explore other funding opportunities”. The Chair noted that this will be further discussed towards the end of the meeting.

5. Action items of previous meetings

The Chair noted that the action item to “seek advice on alternative construction methodologies” will be deferred to when a site is selected.

The Chair noted that other open action items would be discussed throughout the meeting.

6. Project activity update since last meeting

6.1 Engineering appointment

Steve noted that WSP/Tonkin has been appointed to support the site selection phase by developing five concept designs – for the four shortlisted sites and the Billy Lights Point base case – and identifying key risks, opportunities and constraints for each site.

The concept design will consider, amongst other things:

- Marine infrastructure (intake and outfall)
- Desalination plant
- Transfer system (pipeline network from the plant to distributing the water to the customer)
- Power

Gary noted that Jeff Tyler, who is the design manager from Tonkin, was a Port Lincoln local. Gary also noted that WSP have international desalination experience and expertise, including in the Middle East and South Africa.

An SSC member asked whether international design expertise has been utilised in the project previously.

Steve noted that the project was structured differently in the past with greater input from SA Water internally.

Gary noted that the design team was previously working for the contractor, rather than SA Water – which was a very different model.

6.2 Independent Marine Scientific Review Committee

Steve noted that from deputations to various Eyre Peninsula councils and the recent community pop-up sessions, it has become clear that the independent Marine Scientific Review Committee (MSRC) is critical to how the site selection process is perceived by the broader Eyre Peninsula community.

Steve noted the members of the committee and the suggestions received from the project team:

Name	Role	Advisory area
Dr Don Plowman	Committee member	Chair
Dr Anu Kumar	Committee member	Ecotoxicology
Professor Sean Connell	Committee member	Ecology
Dr John Luick	Committee member	Oceanography
Dr Ian Wallis	Committee member	Environmental engineering
Dr Alistair Hobday	Committee member	Marine ecology and fisheries
Dr Hazel Vandeleur	Environmental Lead, project team	SA Water
Nancy Nguyen	Executive Officer	TSA

Steve reiterated the role of the MSRC and noted that the committee’s first meeting will be held at the end of May. Steve noted that Dr Hazel Vandeleur, who is the Environmental Lead from the project team, will be responsible for managing the group and will provide a connection between the MSRC and the project team, and Nancy Nguyen from TSA will be the Executive Officer.

Steve proposed that the MSRC Chair, Dr Don Plowman, be invited to the next SSC meeting.

An SSC member questioned the project team’s involvement in the MSRC.

Steve noted that Dr Hazel Vandeleur and Nancy Nguyen are not members of the MSRC, are only there to support the work of the committee, and will step out of meetings when requested to do so by the independent Chair. Steve noted that Dr Hazel Vandeleur is leading the marine science work being undertaken by the project team and will take direction from the MSRC as required.

Steve noted the initial work of the MSRC as follows:

- Review preliminary work undertaken to date on the hydrodynamic modelling for Boston Bay and Proper Bay (milestone 1, 2 and 3 reports)
 - Point Boston is looking different to Billy Lights Point, but there is a need to understand the MSRC's view before reporting back to the SSC
 - Monitoring stations have been placed at Point Boston (Benthic Profilers) which will provide data for the MSRC's second meeting
 - Variations are within the natural background levels of the bay
- Review three reports provided by the EP aquaculture industry to comment and advise on the risks identified in those reports
- Salinity tolerance report is being peer reviewed in SARDI before being made available to the project team and the MSRC.

Regarding documentation of the MSRC's work, Steve noted that:

- Meeting notes of the MSRC will be made available to the SSC
- Aquaculture industry reports along with MSRC commentary will be made available subject to the approval of the respective industry owners
- Reports commissioned by the project team / SA Water will be made available to the SSC

Gary noted that the list of MSRC members has been shared with executives of government agencies – Environment Protection Authority, Department of Primary Industries and Regions, Department for Infrastructure and Transport, and Department of Planning – to ensure that there is no conflict with the approvals process.

An SSC member questioned whether the MSRC will have input into the concept design work being carried out.

Gary noted that the MSRC will review the Environmental Performance Criteria and will be asked to provide advice on how marine data should be considered by the design team.

An SSC member suggested that the MSRC's work should be an input to the design, rather than an assessment of the design.

Gary noted that the MSRC is a review panel and is not insured to provide design input. However, the MSRC will be able to pass comment on the Environmental Performance Criteria which will be a critical input to the design process.

An SSC member asked what the process would be for resolving any issues that the MSRC identifies.

Steve noted that the design team will need to respond to any comment that the MSRC provides and solve problems that are identified through this process.

Gary noted that this will be done transparently, with the MSRC's findings and the design team's responses to be disclosed to the SSC. If the MSRC provide review comments that require a response on an issue pertinent to the site selection process, then details of the comments and response will be provided to the SSC.

An SSC member noted that there is an opportunity for the MSRC to assess the marine aspects that the design team will be considering and working to.

Gary confirmed that the MSRC will do this.

An SSC member questioned whether the MSRC will be reviewing the four sites shortlisted by the SSC only, or the base case site at Billy Lights Point as well.

Steve confirmed that the MSRC will be reviewing all five sites, including the four shortlisted sites and the base case site.

An SSC member questioned, hypothetically, if the base case site with a different design (i.e., longer intake/outfall pipes) was deemed to be the most appropriate site by the SSC, how would the process consider this.

Gary noted that for the base case to remain a relevant comparison, there could be value in asking the design team to look at how the base case would need to be designed to best mitigate potential risks and therefore what the true cost of the base case would be. Gary also noted that the SSC's task is still to make a recommendation on a viable alternative site as a social licence for Billy Lights Point would still be difficult to achieve.

An SSC member confirmed that if there was additional funding available for a different version of the site at Billy Lights Point, the site still would not achieve social license.

An SSC member noted that it is critical for the base case to be designed to the same standards as the four shortlisted sites in order to make appropriate comparisons with other sites.

An SSC member noted that the costings for the base case must be reflective of a viable site that could achieve social licence, allowing for longer intake/outfall pipes, etc.

An SSC member noted that the base case should be designed with the same Environmental Performance Criteria as the shortlisted sites.

Steve questioned whether the next SSC meeting should include a workshop to identify the SSC's expectations and parameters for a true base case, or whether the project team should draft this and then present it to the SSC for their review and input.

Steve noted that if the Billy Lights Point site was designed differently to hypothetically achieve social licence (if that is even possible), then that would be likely to increase the cost of the base case. The SSC will have to present a preferred site with a social licence to the Government, which will be compared to the base case – as such, the base case site needs to be designed in such a way as to mitigate key risks and deliver on key community expectations otherwise it is a flawed base case.

Gary noted that designing the base case with the same Environmental Performance Criteria as the four shortlisted sites may reveal that the SSC's preferred site is closer in price, and this could help with presenting the SSC's recommendation to key stakeholders.

An SSC member questioned whether there would be greater engineering risk and higher operational costs, if very long intake/outfall pipes were required for the base case site.

Gary noted that building a long pipeline under the seafloor is a very complex task. He noted that the SSC's recommendation will need to consider operational and maintenance requirements for intake and outfall pipes.

The Chair asked the SSC to confirm their view on the extent to which the Billy Lights Point site should be designed in comparison to the four shortlisted sites. The SSC agreed that the project team should continue to scope the base case to meet the same Environmental Performance Criteria to be set for the other sites, plan to mitigate known risks and address broader community expectations (i.e., underground power) in order for a due comparison to be made with the other sites.

6.3 Site activity update summary

Steve noted some of the key activities the project team has undertaken since the last meeting:

- Project team including representatives from the WSP/Tonkin design team have visited the four shortlisted sites and the base case site at Billy Lights Point
- Meetings had with key site stakeholders and landowners
- Discussions with Traditional Owners
- Engaged with relevant Government Agency executives regarding the composition and purpose of the Marine Scientific Review committee – unanimous endorsement
- Engaged with SA Water Executive regarding the four shortlisted sites

- Discussing with SA Water a variation to the delivery methodology Community engagement program largely delivered
- Investigating opportunity for a single pipeline contractor to construct conduits for power supply as contestable works
- SARDI have requested support from the aquaculture industry to inform the particle tracking work.

An SSC member questioned whether SA Water must use SAPN, or if they can use private contractors through a tender process.

Gary noted that conversations about contestable and non-contestable work are underway, and that SAPN will decide what can be put out to tender.

6.4 Site analysis

Steve provided an update regarding progress on the base case at Billy Lights Point (noting the discussion had earlier in the meeting):

- Hydrodynamic modelling is continuing
- Salinity tolerance report is continuing
- Ground survey has been completed
- Design team review of alternate intake and outlet configurations in response to industry concerns
- Application of any innovations emerging from other sites where relevant to maintain credibility of the base case (materials life durability)
- Costing review underway.

Uley South Shoal Point:

Steve noted that two options are being considered for plant configuration:

- 3-4km intake and outfall pipe to very southern end of Gunyah Beach with a 9km transfer main to the existing Uley South borefield pump station (assessment is still required for existing pipeline from pump station to North Side Hill Tanks)
- 2km intake and outfall pipe directly to Shoal Point Cliff with a 10.5km transfer main to the existing Uley South borefield pump station.

Steve noted some of the early findings emerging from the project team's work, including:

- Rare and uncommon plant and habitat species particularly within the coastal escarpments – Southern Emu-wren (EP), White-bellied Sea Eagle, Eastern Osprey, Western Whipbird, Rock Parrot (birds likely to be nesting along some sections)
- Potential for bird strikes on aboveground power lines – power conductors need to be installed underground from the plant site to the wet well cliff foreshore site
- Access roads will need upgrading to enable all weather access – approx. 10km from coast to plant for semitrailer deliveries
- Geotechnical risks for plant and pipeline as geology in the Uley South basin area is known to have voids /collapsible soil (in the bore area)
- The stability of underlying rock strata at Shoal Point requires further investigation for constructability as visible seepage points along the cliff face suggest that much of the cliff top consists of a consolidated calcrete layer riddled with solution holes or seepage lines
- Where possible pipeline follows existing track – but vegetation clearance required up to 22 hectares – vegetation survey to now occur given draft alignment of pipeline
- Engineering – assessing the option to access sea water via bores
- A process is required to solicit approvals from regulatory authorities for extraction from the saline aquifer and this may present timeline issues and the ability to deliver first water by December 2024

- Marine profiling data from previous years will be utilised – ability to deploy monitors due to being a highly exposed open area is compromised and given the ocean environment at this location won't be necessary
- Nil concerns about dispersion – contemplating speaking to regulatory authorities about saline discharge over the cliff.

Gary noted that if some of these innovations are not viable, Uley South Shoal Point as a site may not be possible.

An SSC member noted that there is a precedent for drawing water from a saline aquifer at a smaller scale near Elliston and that the water allocation plan allows for the delineation of a new consumptive pool.

An SSC member questioned whether the plant could be located further inland.

Gary noted that the designers would like to keep the plant as close as possible to the source of water (ideally within three to four kilometres).

An SSC member noted their support for exploring the possibility of extracting water from the saline aquifer.

Sleaford North:

Steve noted that the project team is looking further west than SA Water previously did when assessing this site.

Steve noted that the configuration option being considered by the project team is to have the plant located inland from the coast in a valley where it could be hidden from the coastline.

An SSC member questioned whether the project team is looking at the option of a wet well at Sleaford North.

Gary confirmed that the current thinking is that Sleaford North would require a wet well.

Steve noted some of the early findings emerging from the project team's work, including:

- Potential opportunity for intake and outfall to be positioned to the west of Lone Pine Beach – subject to heritage assessment
- Sleaford community don't wish for the desal plant to be built on the coastline and any pipe/pump infrastructure to be concealed
- Topography of land is likely to require the need for a duplicate discharge pipe (into an inland retention basin or to the ocean if plant is located closer to shoreline) to allow for maintenance on the intake and/or outlet
- Land acquisition needed for plant and pipelines – however consideration is being given to placing transfer pipeline where possible on gazetted roads to minimize acquisition and associated timelines
- Any easement(s) required for the above and below ground powerline to be negotiated with landowners
- Heritage assessments needed at coastal interface where intake and outlets are likely to be located
- About to deploy marine monitoring equipment to supplement the data previously collected
- Opportunity for community benefit:
 - Pump well and viewing platform
 - Jetty structure to provide improved viewing for the public (whale watching).

An SSC member questioned the amount of native vegetation that would need to be cleared at Sleaford North.

Steve noted that it depends on the particular alignment of the intake/outfall pipes.

Gary noted that SA Water owns a highly vegetated parcel of land that could be useful for offsetting vegetation clearance.

An SSC member questioned the level of noise that could be generated by the pumpstation.

Gary noted that pumpstations can be designed so that they can't be heard, and that if the community expectation was such that this was the requirement then this could be factored into the concept design.

To show the sort of innovative thinking that is taking place, Gary shared a variation to the Sleaford North site proposed by a member of the project team that would involve locating the desalination plant on SA Water-owned land near Proper Bay Road, a subsurface intake (i.e., below the sea floor) in Proper Bay, and a new brine pipe to the Lincoln Tank site with the discharge then gravity-fed to Sleaford Bay.

An SSC member questioned whether drawing very salty water (possibly present in that section of Proper Bay) could lead to higher operational costs.

Gary noted that it could, but that further investigation would need to be undertaken to understand the risks and the opportunities that may be presented by the use of this technology.

Several SSC members noted their support for the project team to investigate this idea further to assess its viability, as well as the idea of using a subsurface intake at other shortlisted sites.

Sleaford West

Steve noted some of the early findings emerging from the project team's work, including:

- Opportunity to locate transfer pipeline and power across private land (via easement acquisition)
- Looking at positioning desal plant further inland so as to conceal it from the coastline and take advantage of the lower durability standards that would be otherwise required on the coastline
- Looking at two options:
 1. Crevice solution
 2. Echo Beach (preferred for further investigation, given easier constructability on a high energy coastline and to mitigate costs)
- Possible heritage considerations required at crevice location
- Distance of transfer main approx. 18-20km.

An SSC member noted that there needs to be consideration of the presence of an abalone bottom near Echo Beach, and suggested that it is worth considering Theakstone Crevasse as an alternative site.

An SSC member suggested that the intake and outfall could be located separately for the Sleaford West site.

Point Boston

Steve noted some of the early findings emerging from the project team's work, including:

- Deployed marine science data monitors – and extending the particle tracking and hydrodynamic modelling work that has occurred in Boston Bay
- About to consult with PIRSA and EPA
- A number of locations currently being considered – further discussion required with landowners
- SA Water systems planning looking at options to link into the network (Summit Tanks, North Side Hill Tanks)
- Northern Councils interested in this option because of easier entry into northern part of the network via Summit Tanks
- Possible opportunities to provide benefit to future residential developments (water, power, community assets)
- Possible jetty / community benefit opportunity.

An SSC member noted that a major consideration for Point Boston must be getting the water back to North Side Hill Tanks from Summit Tanks.

Steve noted that if this can't be achieved, then Point Boston doesn't achieve the project objectives set by the SSC.

Gary noted that North Side Hill Tanks and Summit Tanks have the same elevation, and the project team is looking at whether water can be backfed from Summit Tanks to North Side Hill Tanks using the existing network.

An SSC member noted that there could be some potential issues at Point Boston relating to algae and sea grass.

Steve noted that the project team are aware of these potential issues and will consult with the EPA and PIRSA.

Gary noted that the hydrodynamic modelling currently being conducted will be valuable in considering these potential issues.

An SSC member noted that there are fish farms further out from Point Boston that will need to be considered.

Gary noted that the hydrodynamic modelling will demonstrate what will happen with the discharge and that continued engagement with the aquaculture industry at this site will be critical.

7. Assessment criteria for final site selection

Steve noted that draft assessment criteria will be distributed to the SSC for their review and input, so that a scoring system can be set up to support the SSC's decision-making and final site recommendation.

Steve wants to finalise the assessment criteria soon so that the project team can ensure that it is providing information to the SSC that can be aligned.

8. Community engagement update and media announcement

Steve provided an update on the community engagement program and engagement with Councils and Government Agencies that was aimed at soliciting views and opinions on the four short listed sites.

Steve noted the key themes that emerged from deputations to Councils and Government Agencies:

- Strong support for the project and strong support for the process underway – it's refreshing and a unique opportunity
- Water security – do nothing is not an option
- Support for the shortlist – no Council or community Board rejected any of the sites listed
- Understand the role and work of the SSC – very interested in what the SSC ends up recommending to Government and the outcome must be viable and acceptable to Government as the project is needed
- Emphasis on the ability to deliver additional capacity into the network for growth
- Questions around pricing and who pays – and whether the price of water will increase
- Councils are seeking confirmation of the new Government's ongoing government support for the process and funding (i.e., is the \$150 million still on the table)
- Role of Iron Knob to Kimba pipeline into the future and the use of the River Murray once the desal project is completed
- Strong interest in what the community is saying
- Water for mining and Port developments – discussed non-regulated business opportunity and investigation
- Marine Science Review Panel – strong support for their role and work (this is a game changer!)
- Renewable energy
- Aquaculture industry is supported but water security is a priority
- Appreciative of receiving a project update
- Acknowledgment of our efforts to engage with the broader EP community.

Steve noted the key feedback received from the community pop-up sessions:

- Unanimous support for the project and its importance as a long-term water security solution to the region
- Desalination plant is overdue, and it needs to be constructed as soon as possible
- All four shortlisted sites had levels of support and levels of concerns from the community
- Some specific property owners in the Sleaford Bay area have expressed concerns and opposition to this location – they consider their voice is not being heard, that others in the community have greater capacity and lobbying capability and are therefore overshadowing their genuine concerns
- Most of the community is not supportive of Billy Lights Point site and believe that this site should not proceed under any circumstance
- Communities living mostly off rainwater tanks did not express a preference for a site but indicated that water quality and water security is of importance to them
- Those living in and around Port Lincoln are more aware and more engaged and wish to have a say more so than those communities further inland or in the far northwest
- Good awareness of the SSC and the opportunity the community has to influence the outcome – members of the community are looking to the SSC to get it right
- Some concerns about brine discharge and marine impacts (based on a perception that the brine discharge will be at sufficient levels to cause issues)
- Community showed interest in knowing who the Committee members are and how well the community is represented
- Community was aware of our presence through various communication channels (social media, newspapers and radio)
- Some members of the community were committed to drive to the pop-up locations to share their feedback.

9. Other business

The Chair advised of his intention to establish a Funding Sub Committee (FSC) to explore funding opportunities to cover any shortfall, and that several SSC members had agreed to join the FSC.

Following discussion, the SSC agreed that the FSC will comprise of the following people:

- Peter Treloar
- Gary Neave
- Bryan Trigg (Ryan Viney as proxy)
- Brad Flaherty
- Brian Jeffriess
- Delfina Lanzilli
- Jack Ritchie

The FSC will meet prior to the next SSC meeting and will appoint a Chair from its membership.

Steve suggested that some subject matter experts should be invited to present to the SSC, including Dr Don Plowman and Dr Steve Milner. Steve asked the SSC to put forward any other subject matter experts that could bring value to the SSC's discussions.

Bryan Trigg noted that the RDAEP board members were extremely pleased by the work of the SSC to date and Steve's presentation at their last board meeting.

10. Next meeting and close

An agenda for the next meeting will be circulated prior to the next meeting, set for **Tuesday 7 June from 2.00pm to 5.00pm.**

With no further comments, the meeting closed at 5.41pm.

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	Open
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	Open
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	Open
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	Open
7	Draft assessment criteria for site selection to be distributed to SSC for review and input.	Project Team	19/05/22	26/05/22	Closed