



Blue Swimmer

Newsletter of the Friends of Gulf St Vincent

Issue 15, June 2009



President's Report, by John Caldecott

Community Water Summit

It has been a very busy six months for the "Friends", since first discussing the concept of the "Community Water Summit". The event exceeded our expectations in the many community organisations that took an active part on the organisation committee, whilst even more were happy to help promote the event.

As some of the speakers had links with the University of South Australia, and with the added support of The Hawke Centre of the University of South Australia, the organisers were able to stage the event at a very low cost. Delegates who attended the summit were only asked to make a small donation. In return they were treated to world class presentation firstly dealing with water supply and use, implications of desalination on marine life of the Gulfs and finally a workshop to tap the energy of those who stayed behind. The organisations involved with the organising committee were as follows:

Australian Civic Trust Inc, Cheltenham Park Residents Association, Land & Water Australia, Friends of Gulf St Vincent, Western Adelaide Coastal Residents Association, Save Our Gulf Coalition

Nineteen organisations were involved in helping to support the event and these included community organisations from the Lower Lakes to organisations such as the Conservation Council of SA, SA Council of Social Services and SA Unions.

This issue of Bluey contains a detailed and

eloquent record of the presentations by the event scribe Ian Kirkegaard, and captures the breadth of the topics discussed at the Summit. Community chronicler Fernando M. Gonçalves took photographs during the summit and made audio recordings of most of the presentations.

One of the aims of putting this summit together was to build the collegueship amongst community organisations campaigning on water issues in South Australia and to highlight that many of the issues share common themes. As we all know the idea of weaning Adelaide off the Murray to save it was also used to promote desalination to provide water security. Professor Don Bursill in his presentation questioned whether there was a water supply problem with the Murray given the small amount of water used by Adelaide compared to total diversions in the Murray-Darling Basin.

This was a profound position to take, for it means that if there is no crisis in the River Murray supplying water to Adelaide, there is time and money to develop a whole of Adelaide stormwater harvesting solution for Adelaide, increase the amount of wastewater recycling and restore the degraded creeks and rivers of metropolitan Adelaide to achieve the same water security as the Adelaide Desalination Plant.

A key point of difference to the current water security plan by the South Australian government is that water will be cheaper and Adelaide Coastal Waters would be saved. Instead the South Australian government has continued to ignore community concerns and the planned Adelaide Desalination Plant will only add to the significant



Photo by Fernando Gonçalves

Audience at the Community Water Summit

pollution that is destroying the marine heritage of Adelaide Coastal Waters. In addition Australian governments are standing back and allowing the Murray, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth to be starved of freshwater like at no other time in their history.

Submissions

On top of these events the "Friends" have continued to prepared submissions and to contribute to public debate on matters concerning Gulf St Vincent. Some of the submissions completed as this edition of Bluey goes to press include :

Inkerman Landfill, KI NRM Plan, EPP Water Quality, and Buckland Park (Ian Kirkegaard).

Way Ahead

One of the significant areas of concerns for the "Friends" is the practice of dredging, particularly significant given the impeding dredging operations associated with the building of the Adelaide Desalination Plant. Accordingly, the "Friends" are planning to hold its next forum in late August here in Adelaide on the theme of "Dredging – Impacts on the Environment".

In addition, Pat Harbison, Ian Kirkegaard, John Cugley and Angela Gackle have been hard at work completing "Protecting the Gulf Booklet" which is planned for release in August.

The "Friends" would also like to hold a forum at Stansbury before the end of the year to discuss the implications of the proposed Stansbury Marina,



Community Water Summit

Observations by Friends of Gulf St Vincent's Ian Kirkegaard (scribe). All our forums are different, but some are more different...

The venue on this occasion was the Alan Scott Auditorium - with the smiling Maxine Jones and Anne Caldecott greeting folk an hour before the scheduled start. That included several contingents from along the River Murray and the Lower Lakes. We had groups in uniform - T-shirts identifying their cause.

When Mark Henley opened the Summit just after 10 am, there were 100 participants waiting to hear Uncle Lewis O'Brien welcome us to Kurna land.

In setting the themes for the day, President John Caldecott foreshadowed a second summit, which may focus more on the issues facing the Lower Lakes. John also offered for discussion the theme 'Is there water fraud in South Australia'. This established a perspective in which John questioned whether we have a water security crisis in Adelaide or is it a case of mismanagement. John set out his personal view that the issues were so significant that a Royal Commission into water use along the Murray Darling Basin is justified. In the short term we still needed some emergency response, which may require suspension of the national water market.



Prof Simon Beecham—Water Supply Options for Adelaide - Why They Need to be Adaptive

At 10:20 Mark Henley introduced our first speaker, Prof. Simon Beecham, Director of the SA Water Centre for Water Management and Reuse. Simon helped widen the scope of the summit by opening with the comment that he was not convinced that desalination was **not** the answer to Adelaide's water needs. He conceded that the present technology is energy intensive, but suggested it would be foolish not to consider desalination in a mix of sources of high quality water for greater Adelaide. Simon noted that Linda Zou was working on low energy membrane technology at the Centre.

Simon emphasised that desirable features of local water supply should include that it be adaptive, resilient and maintain a range of options, and that was the overarching theme of his presentation.

He also reminded us that water needed to be 'fit for purpose'.

The Australian climate meant that practices developed, say, across Europe, would have to be adapted to the long periods between rainfall events in this country. Simon gave examples of European cities that recorded similar annual rainfall to Australian capital cities, but suffered nothing like the long periods between rainfalls, nor the temperatures that are so adverse to surface storage in Australia during those periods. Even storage underground, in aquifers, had to be adapted to the local regime of high rainfall for short periods.

At local scale, Simon gave details of 'water sensitive urban design' - WSUD, from improvements in engineering to capture water from city buildings down to developments at ground

level, such as porous or permeable paving. Much of the audience was surprised to hear how little of the volume of a downpipe could actually contain water. Apparently such pipes reach a capacity limit of about one-third their volume holding water; the rest is air.

Some domestic needs could be met in part with pits, with plastic liners, filled with gravel and topped with porous pavers. He gave details of a structure that could be used for car parking, but harvest and partially treat water which could be used later on gardens, for an installation cost of just over \$2000.

The Centre had prepared new guidelines for WSUD in Adelaide. They would appear as separate documents to cover the Framework of the concept, Technical Documents and a WSUD Better Development Plan.

Demonstrating the versatility of the Centre, Simon skipped to their study of climate trends around Adelaide. This work did not show a clear and consistent change in rainfall over Adelaide. He emphasised that the focus of that study was on rainfall, not on sustained changes in temperature. Even with the rainfall study, there was a high 'noise to signal' ratio which made it more difficult to show clear patterns, although analysis of the data did suggest there was climatic cycling around Adelaide.

Simon finished on an upbeat note - declaring himself an optimist, who believed that humans were fundamentally clever enough to think of ways out of our water problems.

Question time

Simon Beecham spent much of his question time setting out a precise statement on climate variability. He emphasised he did not want to mislead, however unintentionally, so uttered a caution that he was not saying that there was any stepwise and continuing change in climate over Adelaide. There did appear to be more variability in climate characteristics, but this did not follow a regular trend.

Replies to other questions revealed that the Centre is open to tours, and visitors are welcome.

While harvesting water from rooftops through downpipes is inefficient, retrofitting the more efficient 'siphonic delivery' that Simon showed in videos was expensive. That system was close to cost neutral if installed as original equipment on a building.

Nanoparticles used under porous pavement did not pose a separate environmental threat, as they would remain in the ground.

That was a great mix of information for people to take in, so we thought a coffee break would help. When we reconvened at 11:32, the audience had swelled to 120 as Mark Henley introduced Dr Glenn Walker of the CSIRO Murray Darling Basin Sustainable Yields Project.



Dr Glen Walker—CSIRO Sustainability Yields Project – Water Supply Implications for SA

In 2006, CSIRO was briefed to assess the sustainable yields of surface and ground water in the Murray Darling Basin. This drew on perhaps 100 project people, from all levels of Government, and semi-government bodies such as CSIRO and universities.

Although the basin can be divided into 18 major natural regions, South Australia occupies only two - a large 'Murray' region, and a small Mount Lofty drainage.

Assessment was to go out to the year 2030, and allow for projections on climate change. It should also anticipate expected changes in capture and use for activities such as forestry and farm dams.

An early but disturbing observation was that a drop in rainfall of the order of 10% can reduce runoff by perhaps 30% from the same region.

Over the scenarios of 'wetter' or 'drier' rainfalls in future, the model for some of the 'wet' scenario showed reduced runoff to the south of the system - towards the Murray proper.

Broad findings were that, over the MDB as a whole, 48% of available surface water is diverted each year. This is based on an available 23 400 gigalitres (GL) a year, with 11 300 GL diverted. At times of low rainfall, the diversion ratio can approach 80%. Future uses out to year 2030 suggest that groundwater extraction is likely to rise substantially.

Coming down to 'iconic' parts of the MDB - such as particular wetlands of international significance, or the Murray mouth, Glenn said that the study suggested that the return time of floods that could replenish wetlands could blow out beyond 30 years in the less favourable scenarios. The previous 'natural' frequency for flow to be too low to keep the mouth open seemed to be of the order of 1% of the time, but that was now around 40% of the time.

Question time

Fortunately, Glenn had set aside plenty of time for questions, because he received many.

On the validity of the model, and its data base, Glenn emphasised that it drew on observations for the last 100 years.

The study was not to consider external sources - so he could not speculate on proposals to pipe or otherwise deliver water from tropical coast catchments to the upper MDB.

Silting at the Murray mouth was a simple function of low flow.

Several linked questions asked about water supply to the Lower Lakes. Glenn confirmed that Adelaide drew barely 1% of total diversion, so to not take that water would free up a small, but useful, 80-100 GL that might reach the lakes. The CSIRO study had not tried to determine a minimum flow or a total volume in gigalitres that would maintain the lakes.

When asked to confirm a 'CSIRO climate change policy position', Glenn said that the task with this study was to build up evidence, and that had not been subject to any climate policy direction. Neither was he aware of such a policy in the organisation.

So - loaded with lots more information, and guided by Glenn's interpretation, it seemed like a good time to take a lunch break. One change for this forum was that the Friends did not try to cater lunch. This was partly because of the expected numbers, but also a recognition that there were plenty of places to eat a convenient walk from the Alan Scott Auditorium. And most of us were grateful for a walk.

The first speaker after lunch at 1:10 pm, was Prof. Don Bursill.



Prof Don Bursill—Adelaide's Water Supply – Australia's most Reliable

Don Bursill started by reminding the audience that water restrictions were uncommon in Adelaide over the last half century. There had been some in 1967, but more frequent restrictions dated from 2004. He speculated that some of the mindset that accepted restrictions here had been conditioned by the more 'national' news coverage, with its stories of regular restrictions in the eastern capitals.

Under current restrictions, Adelaide uses about 140 GL a year, down from about 200 GL a year unrestricted.

We reuse about 20-30% of that water. Government praises this as the highest rate in any Australian capital city, but it is still not an impressive number in absolute terms.

We take about 80 GL from the River Murray. In spite of emotive stories in the newspapers supposedly contrasting the livelihood of irrigators with the indulgence of watering gardens and lawns in the city, if Adelaide ceased to draw water from the Murray, the difference would not register on the gauges of irrigation suppliers. It is less than 2% of average flow into South Australia, and < 1% of total diversions.

Don emphasised how spurious the newspaper comparisons were with examples of how much water was taken up in irrigation systems, or just lost in those systems. For example, one NSW irrigation wholesaler requires 300GL just to fill its channels, before one drop of water can be delivered to a user.



Photo by Fernando Gonçalves

Don Bursill and Jim Douglas

He also pointed out that Adelaide's draw on the river was fundamentally academic, because 72% of irrigators in the MDB were not monitored for quantity of water used, nor quality of water discharged after use.

South Australia's 'entitlement' water, under interstate agreement, is for 1850 GL a year. About 600 GL would go to irrigation, 160 to urban uses, and 800 would continue to the Lower Lakes, where much of it would, eventually, evaporate.

There had long been a mindset in other states that that last allocation was water 'wasted'.

Recent strategy reviews had suggested that reliability of supply to Adelaide could be improved by increasing storage capacity in the Mt Lofty ranges. However, there was little extra catchment capacity in the ranges, so that water would still have to come from the River Murray, or some other source.

We were making progress with recycling, as with the Glenelg to city parklands pipeline, but that yielded just 5 GL.

Federal buyback schemes outlaid amounts like \$50 million for 800 GL, plus buying interception land such as Toorale station, but at present that

was not yielding actual water. The water would be there if and when rainfall and runoff returned to recent historic levels, but not before. Don's comment that a buyback scheme should cut the total allocation to all uses to the amounts of water currently available, BEFORE opening the water market, brought prolonged applause from the audience.

Don wrapped up his presentation with observations on the need to improve irrigation efficiency in real terms – that is, to use methods that deliver water to the crop with minimum loss and wastage. He also saw value in harvesting stormwater. It was immaterial if the stormwater was not to drinking quality, because little of the water used domestically really needs to be of that quality, compared with other household, garden and light industrial uses.

Finally - the 'd' word - Don did not see any urgency to construct a desalination plant, given the possible yield from simple efficiencies in the existing system.



Richard Clark— *Organisation Reform to Achieve Democratic & Sustainable Storm & Waste Water Outcomes*

Richard in some ways added counterpoint to Don's presentation although, later in the day, they agreed that they had much more in common than they did in conflict.

Early in his presentation Richard pointed out that while it was true that Adelaide had a problem with long periods between rainfall, through a climate that was adverse to surface storage, Adelaide also had a local flooding problem when the rains came. This caused inconvenience and property damage on land, and damaged the inshore waters of the Gulf St Vincent.

Richard retraced his personal history looking at supply for Adelaide to the time when much of the major infrastructure, built in the 1930s, approached what should have been its scheduled repair and replacement times in the 1970s and 80s.

The group that studied how that might be done concluded that it was economically sound to reconsider the mindset of large process works linked with large pipes. There was much less cost to install and maintain many more small plants, with smaller diameter pipes. Richard noted that the still recently appointed Commissioner for Water Security had already made statements about the supposedly unacceptable cost to install

dual pipe systems to homes, when there were no studies drawing on local evidence or experience that quantified those costs.

Richard attributed some of the continuing 'big pipes, big installations' mindset to lack of integration in water planning at State government level. He contrasted that with the inherent integration of larger councils, where the standout example was Salisbury, with its water harvesting schemes. His observation that, from the Salisbury projects, the public was now much more aware that stormwater was a possible resource, but now damages the Gulf, brought strong applause, with a further round when he referred to the recent comment from the Minister for Water Security that 'stormwater would be too polluted to drink'.

To offer a way forward, from his analysis, Richard noted that politicians seem more occupied with defending unpalatable decisions, rather than reconsidering them, and actively seeking innovation. He suggested that the structures for water management and supply be rearranged. SA Water could be fully privatised, but subject to a powerful oversight agency which would plan the water cycle and require compliance with quantity and quality criteria.



Question time

Don Bursill and Richard Clark took questions together - after a little sparring on the points on which they had different perspectives.

All the questions fitted a theme of 'What can we do?'

Richard observed that politicians and reporters had been invited to the summit, but he could not identify any in the audience.

Don Bursill added a comment on the structural arrangements for water management, that Primary Industries and Resources South Australia was compromised by representing interests of major users of water (primary industries) while supposedly trying to monitor and plan its use as resources regulator. If only for public confidence, these functions should be in different portfolios.

Bob Giles, a long-time participant and campaigner for water harvesting in the Salisbury area, asked, not wholly rhetorically, why not let Salisbury take up surface water management across greater Adelaide. The audience showed its support.

There was also a caution about taking Adelaide completely off the River Murray, because that would tend to reduce our political presence to negotiate allocations along the MDB.

A final technical observation was that if the state government built a weir at Wellington, they could need a desalination plant there to handle the salt loads that were delivered from upstream.

That session wound up right on 2:30, which was a good time for a coffee break, ready for the change of theme - the desalination plant.



Dr Jochen Kaempf—Desalination Plants - Consequences of Desalination Brine Discharge

We reconvened at 3 pm, to hear Dr Jochen Kaempf describe the unusual oceanography of the two large South Australian gulfs. While it is widely accepted that desalination plants using reverse osmosis should be sited where their outfalls can deliver brines, and their mix of other process chemicals, to open seas, with strong currents to mix and disperse the brines, the SA gulfs are characterised by long flushing times. Upper Spencer Gulf needs more than a year to turnover its waters, but even the Port Stanvac site is set above waters with residence times in the order of hundreds of days, compared with 10-20 days at open SA coastal waters.

Jochen then described effects that have appeared in the outflows into Cockburn Sound from the Western Australian desalination plant. The effect that is of most concern is called 'underflow', in which the denser brine spreads across the bottom with only limited mixing. That flow blankets the bottom, and appears to trigger oxygen depletion through bacterial action in the sediments. This was not predicted from modelling for the WA plant, even though the oceanographic processes had been studied fairly intensively in Cockburn Sound, which has major industrial and defence installations.

Gulf St Vincent may be prone to similar effects, particularly during the low flow period of the 'dodge' tides.



Dr Kirsten Benckendorff—Implications of Desalination on local Gulf Marine Life

Dr Kirsten Benckendorff then took up the theme of likely effects of brines on organisms off Port Stanvac. Kirsten pointed out that, by chance, the Stanvac site was in remarkably good condition

biologically because the general public had been excluded from much of the area while it was a refinery and port. Now the area was to be exposed to brines which would carry other chemicals added to aid the osmotic processing, but the common characteristic of those additives was that they are, inherently, 'anti-life'; that is why they are added to the flow.

Kirsten developed the theme of limited accountability for impacts during construction and operation, pointing out that construction was likely to involve extensive dredging or tunnelling, where previous dredging had had marked impacts on reefs in the area.



Jochen Kaempf

Photo by Fernando Gonçalves

There was little information on effects of exposure of local biota to the brine, because researchers had not had access to representative brines from the trial plant, and there had not been the time to cover one, or better, two full seasons of the life cycle of representative animals. Two seasons of observations were sought to follow the protocols of what is known as BACI assessment - Before After Control Impact. If we cannot adequately describe what is there now, we are less able to say if a change has occurred, possibly until it is close to irreversible.

In Spencer Gulf the site preferred by industry for a desalination plant is adjacent to the unique annual spawning aggregation of cuttlefish. It was

now known that exposure to salinities in the order of 55‰ for one hour could kill developing cuttlefish eggs, and exposure for 24 hours to 45‰ could be lethal. This was perilously close to the background salinity in the upper Spencer Gulf, and a level quite likely around a desalination brine outfall.

The necessarily quick experiments on species around Port Stanvac had found several that were vulnerable to the salinities expected around the discharges, although there were other species that were able to survive at least short term exposure up to about 60%. The fundamental problem was the lack of time, and of true test brine with additives, to screen a sufficiently wide range of organisms.

So - with Government pressing on with building the plant without comprehensive environmental impact assessment, the question that Kirsten posed at the

end of her presentation was - What will the Government do if they find a serious impact after the plant has started operations?

Question time

Jochen and Kirsten took questions together. Several sought more information on the experience of the Perth plant. Jochen mentioned reports of areas of low dissolved oxygen in the vicinity of the brine outfall, but observed that it was extremely difficult to get access to monitoring details of this event, which seemed to peak in April of 2008. He understood that the operator of that plant was trying to negotiate ambient values for oxygen out of the licence.

In discussion, both Jochen and Kirsten said in several different ways that they had little faith in the supposed EIS for the Stanvac proposal, because it had been rushed, and because of statements out of Government that virtually prejudged the findings before any of the assessment started.

With our schedule about 20 minutes behind time, our chair and moderators decided to hold one joint workshop, rather than split the audience into separate groups. We still had an audience of about 70. Mark Henley and Jim Douglas nominated the theme as considering some action priorities, and the audience readily focussed on that.

In quick order, members suggested that we needed better procedures to plan land use, and the Natural Resource Management Boards at least had legislation that required them to integrate their planning.

Several participants commented on wider problems in handling information on water and land use issues. The group again applauded the suggestion that we just 'get Salisbury to do it!'

And we seemed to agree that land use was a long-term commitment, so we needed to be reaching kids, now.

David Winderlich - apparently the only member of State Parliament to join us, mentioned the value of having an Independent Commission Against Corruption, to look at some of the apparent conflicts of interest in what should have been water planning for the general good.

And Diane Bell, who had taken the campaign for the Lower Lakes to an election, spoke for using the market in water to maintain the lakes as primarily freshwaters, rather than open then to the sea.

To help us focus, Mark Henley then sought audience approval of perhaps 6 priorities. The votes (but in no particular order) went to

- Drawing up a charter of needs in water management
- Establishing an independent scientific advisory group on the water cycle for greater Adelaide
- An holistic plan for the Lower Lakes
- Extend the Salisbury scheme to whatever suburbs want it
- Co-ordinate a 'WAG' - Water Action Group - of all the separate groups which had participated in this summit
- Maintain a campaign against a desalination plant at Port Stanvac.

The forum finished at 5 o'clock.

Speakers' presentations from the forum can be viewed at the following sites:

<http://civictrust.net.au/page19.htm> and

<http://www.saveourgulf.org.au/watersummit.htm>



Trevor White (Cheltenham Park Resident's Association) and Pat Harbison
Photo by Fernando Gonçalves



Diane Bell
Photo by Fernando Gonçalves



Update on Stansbury Marina proposal

The Oyster Bay Preservation Committee is still fighting the Marina proposal, collecting many more supporters in its wake.

The Environmental Resources Development Committee, comprising six Politicians, visited Stansbury in April along with Pat Harbison, and individually expressed their concern that this should not go ahead, with Bob Such and Mark Parnell following through in writing. ERDC Leader Ms Lyn Breuer [Labor] said, "our people must get over here to have a look at this", meaning Mr Holloway the decision Maker.

Planning SA has advised that the request for an early NO as set out in the EIS Guidelines, "should this proposal be inappropriate" (and it is!) is still to be considered by Mr Holloway but only after the Proponent has presented to the Government his EIS. This would be before it would be made public in the public assessment period.



Photo from Trevor Carbins showing the Pt Vincent kiosk during the recent dodge tide. Who needs a marina!!

Friends of Gulf St Vincent have received copies of letters from the Hon Bob Such, Member for Fisher and Councillor Jackie Emery, from Busselton Shire in WA.

Excerpts from these two letters are below:

Firstly from Bob Such:

"I write regarding the 200 "houses in the ocean estate" (plus 60 Marina berths) proposed for Stansbury.

This proposal is the most outrageous development scheme I have ever seen in SA. It would be environmental madness to cart rock

from the Peninsula and dump it in the ocean so that 200 houses and 60 mariners could be built off shore (extending out almost 1 km!).

This proposal would require a huge cut in the existing cliff face (full of fossilised remains) to allow dump trucks through and would threaten the valuable local oyster industry by bringing in exotic and feral plants and creatures as has happened at Port Vincent.

There would be other pollution threats e.g. nitrogen overload, fuel spills etc etc and the fact is the "houses at sea" development is not necessary. There is plenty of suitable land at Stansbury available for development, much of it with spectacular views etc.

The Port Vincent marina and housing development is still largely unsold, likewise at Wallaroo, so in heaven's name why build another white elephant? (or white whale?)

I urge the State Government to reject this inappropriate development now before the developer spends a lot of money and the wider community gears up for an anti-campaign in the next 12 months."

And Jackie Emery:

"I read with interest you are considering a marina proposal in Stansbury. I am writing to you as an individual, but I am also a Shire councillor for the Shire of Busselton in Western Australia. The beaches of Stansbury in the photos looks a lot like Busselton beaches, and I thought you might be interested in reading of the experience people in Busselton are having in relation to our marina. The email at the end of this is from the action group and was sent to the Premier, many government ministers and the media. I am not a member of the action group.

The marina appeared to be a good idea at the time, and with all the best engineering advice available, it has now created huge, expensive, health and environmental problems for the developer, our State government and even more so for the Busselton Shire. If you take the time to read through the following email it will give you some idea of the extent of the problems the State government and the Shire are now having to deal with. Every year we have huge seaweed buildup which erodes beaches. This causes Hydrogen Sulphide bubbles in the ocean and the fumes produce levels higher than the World Health standards, and appear to cause health problems for residents. The smell is awful. Each year the developer, the Shire and the State government are faced with the problem of how to remove the huge seaweed build up from the beaches. Trucking has been tried, pulping and pumping has been tried, and each time causes

further problems for residents. Eventually the Shire may be faced, when the developer walks away from this, with a financial burden that ratepayers will have to fund. There is an erosion of a beautiful beach east of the most northern groyne, and residents of the area are having problems selling their houses, as some wish to move because of the loss of their lifestyle or for health reasons.

As I say, it seemed like a good idea at the time, providing an amenity and development opportunity for Busselton. Unfortunately, in my opinion, I think it has caused more problems than opportunities. We do have a marina and canal developments, but environmentally and financially it has cost a lot, and continues to do so. If people had the choice now I believe the majority would say leave it alone, don't do it."



SNIPPETS

Maude Barlow Visit

The Community Water Summit committee also organised the visit of international water activist, President of the Council of Canadians and Senior Water Adviser to the President of the United Nations to visit Adelaide for an event at the Grainger Studio organised by the committee, Imprints Booksellers of Adelaide and Black Inc, publisher of Maude's latest book "Blue Covenant". With the help of sponsors; Build Adelaide, Wheelie Friendly Tours and Australian Peace Committee (SA) Maude visited the following water hotspots as part of her visit:

- Salisbury Wetlands WaterShed for a presentation by Colin Pitman, Director of City Projects City of Salisbury,
- Cheltenham Park hosted by the Cheltenham Park Residents Association,
- Port Stanvac Desalination Site where Maude and Pat Harbison (Past President of the Friends) were interviewed by Channel 7 News,
- Lower Lakes, which featured a helicopter tour sponsored by the Rivers Lakes and Coorong Action Group with members Diane Bell and Henry Jones, a visit to the Milang Primary School where they are saving freshwater turtles from a marine tubeworm and community dinner at Diane Bell's on the banks of the Finniss River.



Photo by Fernando Gonçalves

Mayor of the City of Salisbury, Gillian Aldridge, with Maude Barlow and Colin Pitman



Photo by Fernando Gonçalves

Vice President of Friends of Gulf St Vincent being interviewed at Pt Stanvac



Water Action Coalition

The organising committee behind the Community Water Summit and Maude Barlow's visit to SA has been working behind the scenes to act on one of the workshop recommendations; The "Water Action Coalition" movement is planned to be launched at the Salisbury Wetlands WaterShed (at the start of the Salisbury Highway) on Sunday 19th July between 10.30 am & 12.00 pm to help coordinate campaigns for change on water issues affecting South Australian Communities. More details to be announced as arrangements firm up.