

Goulburn Mulwaree Water Management Strategy

**Reference Group Meeting 3**

Council Chambers, 11<sup>th</sup> December 2006

**Record of Key Issues and Outcomes**

**Chair, Reference Group:** Luke Johnson, General Manager Goulburn Mulwaree Council

**Facilitator:** Roberta Ryan, UrbisJHD

**Present:** See attached attendance list.

**Supporting documentation:** See attached PowerPoint presentation and please note the Draft Briefing Paper as was distributed at the meeting

**KEY ACTIONS FOR MEMBERS:**

*Send comments on Draft Briefing Paper by 22<sup>nd</sup> December*

*On receipt from Council – please send comments on revised Strategy Objectives and Process for Shortlisting*

*Council to meet with DPI to fast track discussions relevant to delivery of the strategy*

<p><b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b></p>
<p><b>2. Agenda</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome and introductions</li> <li>• Recap and feedback from meeting two</li> <li>• Agency/stakeholder perspectives for GMWMS</li> <li>• Update on consultation - UrbisJHD</li> <li>• Workshop discussions – technical inputs to date – discussion of process</li> <li>• Next steps and close</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Premier’s water sustainability taskforce overview – Luke</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taskforce – will give us assistance with ‘fast tracking’ certain management options where necessary for short term management</li> <li>• reminder that reporting Reference Group meeting events to the media is against workshop protocols and that the reference group is the forum to discuss any issues/concerns</li> <li>• if this protocol is breached again this meeting – membership of the group will be reviewed</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Review of meeting two</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agreed action from meeting two was to provide comment on schematics produced by PB – Council reported that limited feedback on schematics was received since last meeting – members to send if there are any comments</li> <li>• Reviewing the questions put out at last meeting <i>What are the key perspectives from your organisation in relation to the WMS?</i></li> </ul>

*Is there any additional information your organisation can provide*

*What are the key issues your organisation would like the strategy to address?*

- Council reported that some written responses had been received

Response from David Humphries from the Marulan Business and Tourism Association

- need for allocation of water in Marulan to meet growth
- need for the implementation of water saving measures
- need for water use across Goulburn to be sustainable
- essential for recycling because of non reliable water futures
- recycling based on Triple Bottom Line
- Copford Reach does not meet quality standards, boosting the case for improvements to water quality
- need to capture current water savings behaviours and turn into culture change

Response from Hawkesbury Nepean CMA

- key perspective – interested in river health, therefore interest in the WMS
- maintain equity in terms of planning – water sharing across the catchment
- Question – how will the WMS effect environmental flows? Answer – there are state-wide process for evaluation of the impacts

Response from Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

- key role – managing water licensing
- sustainable water use
- see the community as a key partner
- need to protect water for the environment, including allowing for high flows at times to mimic natural flows
- need for adaptive management (to the specifics of the catchment)
- to fast track process – DNR to meet with Council and Consultants to discuss management options (**action Phil Hansen or Greg Finlayson to arrange meeting**)
- key issues – keeping within legislation, integration with the broader planning context
- DNR can provide information on – licence demand, approvals process

Response from Department of Energy, Utilities and Sustainability (DUES)

(comment sent to Council and will be distributed)

- roles – 2 main – semi regulatory body and provider of Integrated Water Cycle Management (IWMC) guidelines
- guidelines are not mandatory but using them helps in the eligibility of funding
- provides approval for dams/sewage and other infrastructure
- made comment on earlier Goulburn Council water reports – and commented that options investigated in these are worth examining within the context of the WMS
- Key issues – need to validate current issues through firm data sources. Need data to examine the extent of the current shortage. Examination should be done through modelling
- need to plan for demand and population growth
- need to model to secure yield in the context of climate change and variability
- Environmental flows - need to mimic natural flows - guidance can come from the Sydney

experience (DEUS can provide this).

- need for more accurate/transparent costing of management options – which is the most cost effective
- losses – Pejar, current evaporation levels high (comparable to daily use in Goulburn)
- issues with 'dead storage' (inaccessible water in dams)

Question – how much water is lost through Sooley/Rossi transfers? answer (Greg Finlayson) very little

Question – what are the impacts of treated water as environmental flows? Answer (DNR) – big issue, firm answer hard to give, advice can be given from the Sydney experience. Potential flow would be a new impact - Sydney already has STP into rivers, Goulburn currently onto land. Difficult to analyse without a good assessment of options.

Response from NSW Health

Response prepared, will be redrafted and distributed

- interest in long term community health
- monitor water and water systems – public health context
- interest in the quality of drinking water
- need for clear data on the current Goulburn Mulwaree water situation and the urgency of the current situation
- support for recycling undecided – support non potable recycling, but see recycling for potable as a last resort (need for detailed knowledge about the treatment process and how chemicals/hormones/antibiotics etc will be removed and testing for these would occur). Need to know if water is safe for long term consumption
- concern over recycling in the long term if it builds concentrations in the system – inc. building up sewage concentration due to less dilution

Question (Southern Meats) – need drinking water to be high quality to cater for their overseas (EU) markets, can quality of potable recycled be guaranteed? Answer – there are many cases where water is used downstream of STP, there is an opportunity for to get advice from various departments who have experience with this other places e.g. Sydney (Hawkesbury).

Response from Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC)

- roles – issue water licences, respond to environmental incidents, regulating species, aboriginal heritage
- can provide technical advice but not the normal role
- can provide experienced advice gained from Metro experience
- encourage GMC to work toward sustainable WMS in the short and long term – avoid short term fixes that create problems in the longer term
- have guidelines available – e.g. amount of sewage that can be put onto land, water quality
- comments on potential options – using treated effluent as environmental flows, needs to ensure protection of the environment, down stream quality, is it suitable qual/quant? (guidelines will be made available in web link on notes to be provided)
- Same requirements for aquifer recharge schemes – would quality be good enough? (guidelines available)
- sewage treatment considerations – concentrated stream (brine stream) is expensive and difficult to manage, need for cost and environmental analysis
- interim STP upgrade – more land – there will be a need for a longer term sewage capacity upgrade
- need to balance management with environmental impacts

#### Response from the National Water Commission (NWC)

- NWC is a national body with 7 commissioners that report to the PM – agreement aims to provide consistency in the management of water (environmental flows/sewage etc)
- the commission is developing guidelines (standards) for water management that should be ready by mid 2007, standards will consider water quality
- can assist Council in working with the guidelines
- there will be a variety of options and schemes that will need to be analysed on a case by case basis
- the GMCWMS should be consistent with the National Water Initiative
- funding from the commission requires that the strategy is consistent with the initiative

#### Response from Department of Primary Industries (DPI)

- manage a range of industries (e.g. forestry/fishing)
- GMCWMS strategy needs to be consistent with Metro water sharing plans – or have a justification if not
- there is a need to balance town water needs with fisheries/agricultural industry/agriculture
- can provide assistance with reuse schemes
- particular interest in the balancing of agriculture and town needs

#### Response from Sydney Catchment Authority (SCA)

- part of the same catchment
- interest in water quality
- roles – potable water suppliers and regulators/protectors of catchment
- NOBE – ‘Neutral or beneficial effect’ – principle applied to assess new systems
- SCA is looking at the major water issues in the catchment and prioritising actions
- working with local governments to upgrade management systems
- manage the Wingecarribee reservoir – potential supply option
- have modelling capacity which can be offered to GMC
- have water metric data
- monitor fish, weed etc
- have water quality risk management framework
- key issues for WMS – water qual/sustainability/downstream impacts.
- metro water planning projects – can share experience with GMC
- options – alcohol based surface film developed (evaporation management), expensive

Questions – can the Wingecarribee be an option? Answer – about balancing needs, supply of Sydney needs to be considered as does local needs, decision would be made beyond SCA level.

Question – is the Shoalhaven an option? answer – more information available next year

Question – is a Wingecarribee/Shoalhaven pipeline an option? the cost of this option led to it being shelved before.

- it was commented that there are a range of options on the table

Question from Paul Stephenson (Mayor) to NSW Health – there is sewage in the Warragamba catchment and animal that may cause antibiotics in the system (referring to earlier comment by NSW Health), is this currently tested, and if not why does this have to be tested more so for recycled systems. Answer – water is monitored for quality but not for those pollutants mentioned. NWC noted that there are already cities that have sewage in their water supply due to upstream discharge and that quality assessment need to be made, and the experience could be learnt from

- raising of the Cotter Dam - being considered (a wall upgrade, or a new wall). As an option for Goulburn's water supply issues include, control by the ACT, pipeline costly (\$20-30 million just to Yass)
- comments on 'Dead Water' – not dead but 'deep' turns over every winter as the surface layer cools and mixes during this time

Question – is NOBE hard to do in Goulburn if we go from land based sewage disposal to surface water disposal (use as environmental flows) **(question will be followed up with SCA NOBE experts)**

Response from Goulburn Water Group

- Need to get out of level 5 restrictions
- need fool proof recycling
- issue is urgent
- rain would be bad because the current issues would be forgotten

Response from the Department of Planning

- roles – working with GMC on a new Local Environment Plan (LEP)
- key consideration – minimum lot sizes and proximity to streams
- need to integrate information for WMS into LEP

ACTIONS – all organisations to submit there responses to the comments by the 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2006 – submitted to Greg Finlayson [Greg.Finlayson@goulburn.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Greg.Finlayson@goulburn.nsw.gov.au)

## 5. Consultation update

- Councillor briefings
- Briefings with Council staff
- Reference Group meetings (3)
- Working Group meetings (4)
- Working group/DUES meeting
- Councillor interviews
- Meeting with Goulburn Water Group
- Fact sheet distribution
- Website updates
- Stakeholder interviews – being conducted now
- Community Vox Pop
- Community and Business survey
- Community workshops

*Community Vox pop video*

- Conducted around the Central Business District in Goulburn
- Snapshot – Not representative
- People views in their own words at a that time
- For workshop warm-up

*Workshops*

- *Marulan 30th November 6pm – 9pm (18 people)*

- *Goulburn 6th December 1pm – 4pm (40-50 people)*
- *Goulburn 6th December 6pm – 9pm (40-50 people)*
- *Tarago 11th December 6pm – 9pm (18 people)*
- *Based on information to enable an informed discussion. Working together in small groups to:*
  - Share ideas and knowledge
  - Identify key issues
  - Suggest options for the future
- *How did people come to the workshops?*
  - Business and Community Surveys participant who gave details were contacted by UrbisJHD and invited
  - Advertised in local print media on a number of occasions
  - Letterbox drop in Marulan
- *Workshop outcomes*
  - Better knowledge about the process to develop the Goulburn Mulwaree Water Management Strategy
  - Initial ideas in response to preliminary information
  - Outcomes will be considered alongside those from other workshops and discussions with stakeholders, government, and survey feedback
- *Workshops - agenda*
  - Welcome and Introductions
  - Community Vox Pop video
  - Background and Context
  - Community and business survey results
  - Small Group Discussions
  - Feedback and Discussion
  - Next Steps and Close
- *Workshops - process*
  - Background and context
  - Small group discussions of briefing papers – copies can be provided to you
  - Group discussion - Vision for the Water Management Strategy
  - Thinking about the vision for Goulburn City that was identified as part of the 2020 strategy process – what does that mean the Water Management Strategy has to deliver?
  - How will the Water Management Strategy help to deliver your vision?

- Feedback and further comments forms
- *Workshops – participant evaluation*
  - Overwhelming agreement that workshops were successful
  - Balance of information good – one workshop had difficulty bridging the information needs of participants
  - Great outputs – quality suggestions
  - Strong commitment and engagement by community to WMS process

## **6. Afternoon tea and refreshments**

### **7. Discussion**

Strategy objectives – page 99 of context paper

- Question – are these in priority order? answered (PB) not in priority order
- comment (various) – 1 and 7 should swap
- support that they should be reordered and priority listed
- comment – objective 1 too static should be ‘be valued by’ or ‘value the document and use it for funding’
- comment – objective 2 as the overarching objective (support by several), reply (Greg Finlayson) need to insure that the objectives do not just consider supply

ACTION – PB to review and redraft objectives in light of comments and distribute to Reference Group by 13<sup>th</sup> December

Discussion of the options short listing methodology

- various – sound except for 3/4/5 – needs to be a simultaneous consideration of 3/4 regulation and environment
- Greg Finlayson – this process will be used to identify the ‘building blocks’ for the strategy. A 1<sup>st</sup> cut for options that may be considered further
- Comment - need to show the overall at the front- maybe need to reconsider regulations
- comment (DUES) – options in isolation may not look good, but when part of a bundle may be effective – (will the methodology be limited if) options are viewed in isolation are cut even though they may have merit as part of a bundle
- Greg Finlayson – process will allow a high level ranking e.g. a 50km pipeline is more cost effective than a 300 km one
- comment NSW Health – need to consider public health in the process
- comment DEC – need to bundle environmental and health
- comment DEC – methodology may be too linear, need to zoom down to a level to understand issues such as yield/environmental impact/cost etc. If considered at too high a level you may eliminate options that will work as part of a bundle. Reply (Greg Finlayson) – most existing options would stay beyond this first cut
- comment SCA – consider the cost per mL in the options analysis
- 

### **8. Agreed Actions**

- submit responses to question from meeting two to Council by 22<sup>nd</sup> December (all organisations)

- Review strategy objectives and distribute to all participants (Parsons Brinkerhoff)
- Redraft the methodology subsequent to comments and discussion and distribute to all participants (GMC)

**9. Next Steps and Close**

- Next meeting date – Monday 5th February
- Agenda – First round bundling; first round short listing of options; summary comments on concept report
- Update on Task Force actions