



Liz Penfold MP

MEMBER FOR FLINDERS

Suite 16, 60 Tasman Terrace

PO Box 1798

PORT LINCOLN 5606

flinders.portlincoln@parliament.sa.gov.au

www.lizpenfold.com

Phone: (08) 8683 0722

Fax: (08) 8682 5912

Ref: STE3N9:JL09

Date: 27 February 2009

Eyre Peninsula Natural Resource Management Board,
PO Box 291
PORT LINCOLN 5606

SUBMISSION

RE: DRAFT EYRE PENINSULA NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The latest plan released by the Eyre Peninsula Natural Resource Management Board comprises of four volumes which together make up the first comprehensive and integrated NRM Plan for the Eyre Peninsula region.

I commend the Board for collating all the information contained in the 'State of Our Resources' report in particular because most of this data is generally not contained in one document.

The Plan will set the direction for the Board for the next five years. It is therefore important that extensive community input is obtained. Unfortunately, it is another report and being such a large report it is unlikely to be widely read by the general public. I also believe that some of the information is incorrect and/or not up to date and I have listed these separately. See Attachment 1.

The role of the Board with its many and diverse activities, is directed and defined in the NRM Act and future funding for projects necessitates a report of this nature. However I doubt that the 'ordinary' person, (whom the Board is trying to attract to be a volunteer or participant in on-ground projects), is going to be induced to read this lengthy report. Nor will it help overcome the very real cynicism within the

community about the NRM structures and role in the management of the region, which was acknowledged in the Report. The strong governmental message of increased regulation and control overrides economic development and growth which is not what people are looking or waiting for, particularly when they are doing it 'tough'. If this is to have any real value to the general public it needs to be much more succinct and more outcome focused. The Board has an important role to play given the importance of our natural resources and should be providing leadership and direction for Federal, State and Local Governments, the community and other organisations to follow.

The wide range of comment and extensive information in this lengthy document makes it appear that the NRM Board is responsible for 'everything'. A number of other agencies and departments are totally or partly responsible for management of many of the sectors mentioned in the report. For example DEH, PIRSA, DWLBC and local government would be the relevant authority in many instances. This should be acknowledged and the demarcation between them defined. Or is this a 'sign' of the future whereby individuals, via the NRM levy, will be paying for what were previously State Government responsibilities.

The Board's Vision statement "**Natural resources supporting ecological sustainability, vibrant communities and thriving enterprise in a changing climate**" sounds great but the emphasis throughout the report appears to be the opposite. The Plan does not explore opportunities for better management or promote new opportunities, incentives and partnerships.

For example: State of Our Region – Page 124 –Under the heading of "**Key threats and influences on the condition of the resources**" a number of so called threats were listed.

Continued economic growth should be viewed as a challenge not as a threat. Orderly and sensible development can have positive outcomes and many areas would benefit from some levels of control and education rather than the current 'lock out' approach.

One of our biggest assets is our residents. Without them there is no community, no volunteers, no custodians, and no rate or tax payers to pay for the every increasing costs of ensuring that our natural resources are maintained. However there is no acknowledgement of local community expertise and knowledge.

Most of our small communities have had significant reductions in their population because of the expansion of farming enterprises, often encompassing three former farms, and the decrease in family sizes. This has made many small communities unviable with shops and schools closing. Communities and enterprise should be encouraged to grow because they contribute significantly to the economy of the

region, provide jobs and often much needed infrastructure even though they may increase pressure on the region's natural resources.

I do not believe that staying within environmental constraints is the way for our communities to progress and remain vibrant. If our forebears had not 'pushed the edge' and challenged the accepted practice of the day we would be extinct like the dinosaurs or still be cave dwellers. Instead humans have adapted, worked with what they had and/or invented a means to overcome any deficiencies. They built dams to collect water, put in weirs to ensure that river levels were maintained, invented aeroplanes, built road and railways, realised that fertilizer helped crops grow, cleared trees and then recognised that too many trees have been cleared, etc. However today and in the future it appears from the Plan that we are to curtail our activities, adhere to prescribed processes and conserve. I agree that we must ensure that our environment is not decimated however we must keep changing and investigate new technologies that will allow our communities to grow and prosper and enable us to continue to enjoy our lifestyle in the Eyre Peninsula region.

The Board must promote rather than discourage new or different technologies such as new sources of water, new methods of storing energy (eg graphite blocks). All of which are being used in other regions or countries but for some reason are not being encouraged in South Australia.

- Lloyd Energy was prepared to build a solar thermal desalination plant at Ceduna. It would have replaced water being taken from the over drawn underground water basins south of Port Lincoln being pumped to Ceduna. It would have also ensured that Ceduna had a less mineralised water supply. Currently the water in Ceduna is so mineralised that it is costing thousands of dollars to replace piping and water filters in the region. However Lloyd Energy were denied access to SA Water pipes and this technology is now being used interstate and overseas. Eyre Peninsula still has no new water and its future development is being restricted. Enclosed is a copy of an article regarding the use of graphite blocks to store energy now being used in Queensland. Attachment 2.
- Creating our own micro climates will help Australia to survive and thrive and we could show the way on Eyre Peninsula because with all the existing vegetation, available wind energy and the solar energy we are already part way there.

We know how micro climates affect us because we experience Port Lincoln's. By being almost surrounded by sea and having hills behind reducing winds Port Lincoln is significantly cooler in summer and warmer in winter than Adelaide and receives more rain. The Amazon River catchment has a micro climate because of the water vapour that

accumulates above the Amazon forest causing even more rain as winds are slowed and the clouds become overladen with water vapour.

Australia is being targeted as one of the most vulnerable countries to climate change on Earth. Eyre Peninsula must assess its position and work out what can be done to help delay and reverse it while maintaining and even improving our environment and lifestyles.

Water is critical. Using wind and solar energy combined with graphite block technology we can have thermal desalination plants along the coast of Eyre Peninsula to provide all the water the region needs from the sea.

We can think big, desalinate lots of sea water, send it through our existing pipes across the region, change our farming practices, value add and diversify our products and come out on top or we can think small and struggle along with everyone else.

When there is plenty of cheap water more crop trees can be grown that use up CO2 and shade the ground all year. Growing trees for profit, as is being done in Western Australia supported by the government owned Verve Energy (www.verveenergy.com.au), may be one way of doing this. In our Mediterranean climate all Mediterranean fruits and vegetables, olives, nuts, camphor wood, mallee and tea tree oil are possible and we have sufficient good soils to do it.

The tops of hills and the valleys should be reforested with local flora by direct seeding from land or by air, creating a full habitat at all levels from the smallest to the largest. Carbon credits gained from this would help to pay for it to be undertaken, fenced and maintained with feral animal and weed control.

To get started on this fundamental change we must undertake to immediately:

- a) Eliminate feral rabbits that are beginning to thrive again and will destroy much of our environment as they have done before.
- b) Build thermal desalination plants using renewable energy, producing no contaminants and either dispersing the highly saline water or keeping it on land and holding it as salt.
- c) Gain access to our SA Water pipes for the desalinated water to enable it to be cheaply dispersed across the region.
- d) Plant productive and profitable farm tree crops to reduce wind speeds, sequester carbon and increase humidity using the available water as required

- e) Plant profitable food and animal feed crops on reduced areas of good soil, irrigating them when necessary to keep production, profitability and evaporation high and ground temperatures low, all year round
- f) Lot feed sheep, lambs, cattle etc to produce high quality wool and meat.
- g) Reforest hill tops and valleys with native vegetation to slow wind speeds, prevent wind and water erosion and assist in building the micro climate of the area
- h) Mine our minerals, value add them and then rehabilitate the land using the existing infrastructure and people to ensure that the communities are maintained after mining with intensive agriculture, aquaculture and tourism. (That this can be done can be seen in part in Dubai where oil is running out but the profits from it and the infrastructure built are being used for the tourism industry and many other industries despite nothing but a desert being there before.)

Caring for Our Resources – page 23 – 10.3 – **“Great economical value is associated with the coast, both in natural resource industries and through activities that prosper in a coastal environment”**.

Caring for Our Resources - Page 91 – 5.5 – **“Private landholders manage most land resources on Eyre Peninsula”**.

I am becoming increasingly concerned about the large tracts of land that are being annexed by the government for ‘environmental’ purposes.

I questioned the prevailing premise that ‘remote’ areas are more fragile and therefore needed more protection and made more inaccessible. Why are ‘remote’ areas more fragile than other areas and why can’t they be sustainably developed. I believe this is just a way of ensuring that this region in particular stays undeveloped. Visitors to the region do not contribute towards the cost of keeping “a wild and pristine coastline” yet they expect a certain amount of development to allow them to visit. Why should ‘remote’ communities be further disadvantaged? These communities are custodians of their region – they love where they live and they don’t want another “Glenelg” but closing all avenues for coastal development is neither fair nor responsible.

During the Perpetual Lease Accelerated Freeholding (PLAF) process I was contacted by many owners who were angry and dismayed by the amount of land the Government acquired as part of this process in the name of conservation and sustainability. I believe the freeholding process was one of the most inequitable processes undertaken by the Government. The freeholding exercise allowed the Government to claim significant tracks of coastal land with no compensation being offered to property owners who were in many instances third generation custodians. To add insult to injury, these land owners had to pay substantial surveying and fencing costs. Lessees were placed in a no win situation if they did not take

advantage of the PLAF program because their property could not be sold unless it was freeholded and in the future freeholding costs were going to be substantially increased. Hence the Government had them over a barrel.

Now the Government is asking councils to sign off on the Better Development Plans (BDP) and the State Government driven Coastal Management Strategy. Since the actual detail and specifics of the coastal policies were released by Planning SA there has been mounting concern about how restrictive and far reaching the policies are going to be. Once again significant portions of Eyre Peninsula coastal land are being annexed.

In 2005/06 I commended Councils for working in conjunction with Planning SA to develop a long term vision and policy to guide future development on coastal areas. The strategy was intended to develop a Coastal management Strategy to help guide future development and provide consistency around South Australian coastlines. **However I was extremely concerned that the Strategy appeared to be delivering a strong message of increased regulation and control which overruled any provision for economic development and growth.**

The wording of the nine strategies in the Draft Coastal Management Strategy took a broad view with 'motherhood' statements and a much generalised perspective very similar to the current Marine Park information and EPNRM Report. I suggested at the time that documents worded in this way are subject to differing interpretations and can result in quite draconian regulations being introduced, if not immediately, at some time in the future as I have already witnessed in my time in Parliament with the removal of the Coffin Bay ponies and the lack of tourist facilities at Paney Station. Promises were made but not kept by subsequent governments who cannot be held to previous government's decisions. It is no surprise to me therefore that this is exactly what has happened.

The BDP process and the merging of the Coastal Development Strategy has resulted in the State Government annexing large tracts of Eyre Peninsula coastal **freehold** land. Councils were supportive of controlled and planned development but could not have possibly foreseen the extensive tracts of coastal land that are now effectively shut off from any form of development because they have been included in the Coastal Conservation Zone which is effectively a conservation zone managed and paid for by private individuals with no compensation.

The coastal zoning regulations result in the land holder still being the 'owner' of the land however the list of non-complying developments outlined in the PAR is comprehensive; including farming, land division, dwellings (with a few exceptions), marinas, motels, and tourist accommodation greater than 50 rooms, water tanks and dams, etc, etc which negate any possible alternate use of coastal land and severely limits future retirement funding or farming options, effectively taking away their

right to use the freehold land they own and again without compensation. One frustrated land owner wrote *“It is quite clear that restrictions placed on land use which prevents you from living on that land is the closest thing to annexing the land.”*

Planning SA appears to have taken an 18th Century approach and drawn straight lines across a map using features such as main roads as boundaries of the zones. This is concerning but what is alarming is that in many instances the inland boundary is a number of kilometres from the coast line. Traditionally there has been a 20 metre set back from high tide mark or cliff tops. During the perpetual freehold process this was increased to 50 then to 100 metres and beyond. I am aware of land between 2.5 to 8 kilometres inland from the coast being included in the Coastal Conservation Zone rendering it useless for any other purpose, other than a defacto privately owned conservation park (not the wish of the owners). The Department will be able to acquire it at a much reduced price from that expected for freehold land with fabulous views. The bonus for the department is a neatly squared off boundary of their surrounding Conservation Park. They can then feel virtuous and self righteous at absolutely no cost to themselves or their loved ones (generally living in their city areas with all facilities) but leave the owners with unexpected costs and/or reduced income from what in many cases might be their superannuation for their retirement or their children’s inheritance.

This is supposedly for the benefit of many however no compensation or consideration has been given to individuals or the farming families who while they live in a beautiful area are struggling with drought, long distances, fewer services and choices. The majority of them have owned the land for generations and have been good custodians. Ironically those who have been the best custodians are being penalised the greatest as their land is now the most desirable. They are feeling disenfranchised. Why should they pay for the rest of the State?

The NRM Plan includes State Government’s plan to add another 10,000 hectares of native ecosystems which includes watercourses and coastal and marine ecosystems. will increase this feeling of not being valued. Where are the communities and agricultural operators going to be allowed to exist?

Who is going to manage these vast tracks of land? Fire will be and is already an increasing risk and feral plants and animals will no doubt thrive. Previously property owners were responsible and they would also have kept an eye on irresponsible behaviour however this will no longer happen. Already it is obvious in our national and conservation parks, and also water reserves that feral animals and plants are increasing.

State of Our Resource -Page 67 – 4.5 – **“DEH has primary land management responsibility for 99 parks and reserves (3,545,775.433 hectares) dedicated under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 across the EP region”.**

There are also significant hectares of SA Water reserves that should also be listed and management undertaken.

In the last few State Government budgets DEH has had their funding cut and on ground management levels are at a bare minimum. However glossy self-glorifying brochures are being produced by the bucket loads. In contrast local park maps are no longer being produced and various projects including the threatened species project have been cut off completely. Surely NRM Boards are not going to be responsible and farmers who have had their land taken away and activities restricted are going to be asked to pay management costs via the NRM Levy!

Managing Our Resources – Page 27 -Target C – **“Water, in scattered wetlands, groundwater and surface water, is a precious resource on Eyre Peninsula. It requires sustainable management so that the demands of the natural environment are considered alongside community and industry requirements”**.

Managing Our Resources – Page 28 - Target D – **“Water quality in surface water, groundwater and marine water resources is maintained and improved to meet the Environment Protection (Water Quality) Policy 2003 standards”**.

We should not be relying on ground water supplies for our base line water supply. The sooner we have access to ‘new’ water supplies then the community can be assured that our precious underground resources will be sustainable in the future. Private companies have wanted to establish desalination plants however SA Water’s monopoly is prohibitive. See the Lloyd Energy example previously mentioned.

I was pleased to read the article in the Independent Weekly on January 30 that Flinders University researches are examining the potential threat from sea water incursion to the water supplies on Eyre Peninsula. This is an issue of real concern that has been talked about for years. The Board should encourage, where possible more independent studies of our underground water system because past management practices have clearly been inadequate and changes have taken place after the event rather than taking a more informed pre-emptive approach eg Robinson and Poldas Basins.

In 2001 the Interim Report on EP’s Water Supply Master Plan advised that “water supply on the peninsula is nearing its usage capacity. The vulnerability of the water supply on recharge from rainfall mean that in order to sustain further economic development, some additional capacity must be built into the system to ensure reliability and security of supply”. It went on to state that ‘quantity of water is not the only issue facing the peninsula. Another major concern is the quality of the water’.

Since the 2001 report what has been done? In 2009 the Robinson Basin is being filled with water pumped from the Southern Basins. Poldas Basin has been shut down and local residents are having water carted. Many people are facing difficulties maintaining a water supply to their property because of the quality of the reticulated water. The public still do not know how sustainable the Coffin Bay Lens is and the Port Kenny lens – investigations have been limited and full extent is not well defined at least in the public arena.

The Media Release on 27 November 2008 attempted to place the blame on the EPNRM however the Board is reliant on advice and information from SA Water and the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity (the old managers).

State of Our Resources – Page 104 – 6.2.1- The Tod Reservoir has been mismanaged and I note in this report SA Water have reported that **“Recent assessments have shown that insufficient water is available for consumption (SA Water 2008)”**.

State of Our Resources – Page 123 – 6.5.1 **“SA Water (2008) outlines five system enhancement and new water resource options:**

- **rehabilitation of the Tod reservoir”**

If the above assessment is correct why rehabilitate? Why not let it become a recreational reserve to be called upon in emergency situations?

State of Our Resources - Page 91 – 5.4.3 - **“Industrial developments, and any increase in intensive agriculture or mining in the region, may be limited by water availability, although some water requirements for mining can be met by using non-potable higher salinity water”**.

State of Resources – Page 125 - Industrial Water Demand - 6.6.2 **“The water demand of industrial developments and any increase in intensive agriculture or mining in the region may be limited by water availability”**.

This is not good enough. We already have graphite, kaolin, mineral sands and iron ore that won't be value added even if they can get enough water to mine, unless plentiful water is available. For the benefit of this region and the State we should be investigating what can be done to ensure the Eyre Peninsula region is able to benefit from mining and from value adding before we export as other states have done, not just say it is too hard or impossible. Our towns need the people these developments will bring to maintain their viability as the farms get bigger and families fewer and smaller.

The current impasse regarding access to water pipes must be resolved to allow desalinated water to be utilised throughout the region. This would then assure that

“flow regimes with significant catchments are able to be managed to meet the requirements of water dependent ecosystems and sustainable use” (C.2)

I believe, a large scale desalination plant on the far west coast of EP supplemented by renewable energy supplies located adjacent to the high energy waters of the Great Australian Bight, which would ensure that the discharge of brine would be dispersed reducing any impact on the marine environment, is the best solution.

The desalination system would underpin the supplies to the subsequent mining operations and the future supply of water to the far north of South Australia as other mining operations commence operations.

A new pipeline from there to Roxby Downs would provide the required link whereby the future supplies are able to be drawn for new mining operations, in addition to acting as strategic backbone of water supply, with the capacity to increase to support growth in the far north. This water supply would remove the environmental concerns of drawing from the upper Spencer Gulf and could be supplied with renewable solar wind or wave power.

Smaller desalination plants at Streaky Bay, Venus Bay, Port Kenny and Elliston should be considered. Another big desalination plant at Port Lincoln or Elliston using wind energy is also needed in the future.

State of Our Resources – page 96 – 5.5.2 - **“Water is a scarce resource on EP, and is essential for sustaining livestock enterprises in farming systems”.**

“Water availability has always had a significant influence on the occupation of EP and the use of its resources”.

These comments are true however what is needed is vision and the drive to investigate what can be done to overcome these challenges.

To force people to provide tanks, pumping systems etc at their own cost is cost-shifting from the public to the private sector and is pushing up the cost of living and home ownership. It is also the most expensive and least efficient way to provide water and provides no opportunity for new diversification or value adding enterprises.

The extended pipeline from Whyalla and delivery of 1.4 gigalitres, and even the proposed increase to 2.3 gigalitres at some future time, will not bring sufficient additional water to remove existing restrictions on Eyre Peninsula. The best use of this pipe would be to send the water back to Whyalla. Since the advent of the EP Catchment Water Management Board, SA Water was given an overdraw allowance of 5% from the Uley Basins on EP in 2004/05 and requested more in 2005/06. What overdraw they have been granted since then is unclear. SA Water has undertaken to ‘repay’ this water at some time in the future. How are they going to ‘repay’ because the water has been used and just can’t be returned.

State of Our Region – Page 122 – 6.5 – **“For farmers who had to pay for access to a pipeline (whether they used the water or not) there was a clear incentive to use water from the system and avoid the maintenance their own schemes required”**. This may be correct in some instances however many people are continuing to battle to maintain their water supplies because the quality of the water available from the SA Water is so poor. Pipes are blocked in a very short time and constant maintenance and repairs are proving to be very time consuming and costly. This is a big concern for many people and should be acknowledged in this report. It should also be noted that SA Water deliberately bulldozed significant tanks often against the wishes of the local farmers.

State of Our Region - Page 124 – 6.5.1 - **“200 abandoned stormwater harvesting schemes across the region”**

In 2007 I wrote to the then Minister for Environment asking that the many old underground tanks and water catchment schemes be rejuvenated. I suggested that rubber lining or a bladder would be a quick and effective solution to sealing in time for the winter rains. The Board undertook an investigation and did a report but nothing seems to have happened since then.

Caring for Our Region - Page 33 – 7 **“Dams for stocks and/or domestic purposes shall only be constructed if there is insufficient or inadequate water available on the property, such that:**

- a. **there is no capacity to connect to SA Water supply or...”**

State of Our Region – Page 95 **“SA Water supplies are a precious resource which are not unlimited”**.

State of Our Region – Page 95 **“Water supply for sustainable livestock production is an emerging issue as demand on this limited resource increased an average annual rainfall decreases”**.

The decline in cropping margins will result in many farmers looking at their options including reintroducing livestock. The above statements do not provide farmers with any confidence that they will be able to access water for their livestock and other farming activities in the future. The livestock is still not even at the levels we used to have on Eyre Peninsula.

Caring for Our Resources - Page 11 **“Critical to the effective implementation of this framework is vigilant monitoring of compliance throughout the region so that inappropriate activities are reported and can be addressed at the earliest stage before they develop into more severe issues”**.

There appears to be an insidious expectation developing in the State that people are to 'dob' in their neighbours. What has happened to the theory that education is the best method to bring about change?

Caring for Our Resources - Page 12 4.1 **“Given the distance between population centres of the region, Eyre Peninsula faces considerable challenges in engaging the community in natural resource management and sustaining that engagement into the future”.**

This is why concerns were expressed when the number of NRM groups was reduced to two across the huge Eyre Peninsula. Local ownership is not possible with such vast distances, differing issues and small populations. These people are also earning a living looking after families and volunteering in emergency services, schools, hospitals, churches and sporting clubs.

Caring for Our Resources - Page 14 - 5.2 **“Ensure management plans aim to reduce pest animal and plant impacts, rather than just pest animal and plant numbers”.**

I am not exactly sure what is meant by this but I would have thought that a reduction of pest animals and plants numbers would result in a reduced impact and the ultimate goal should be extermination, particularly of wild goats, rabbits and foxes.

Caring or Our Resources - Page 22 **“The principles for ‘complying standard’ are “A permit may be granted without further assessment provided a certificate has been obtained from the Board certifying that the person complies with the Best Practice Operating Guideline (BPOG)”.**

No where in the volumes, is the BPOG detailed or an explanation of what is involved. I am sure many landowners when or if they read this would throw their arms up in the air.

Caring for Our Resources – 5.6 - Development Plan Amendments – Page 40

“Principles

1. Encourage councils in prepared DPAs for rural and primary industry zone to undertake investigations to identify preferred land uses based on land capability and aim to minimise environmental impacts on water resource, soil and biodiversity.

3 Third dot point – Where a development application is received for a significant development that may impact on water, polices should encourage the preparation of a hydrological study.

1. Suggest provisions across the council development plans that encourage applicants to prepare farm/site management plans for uses such as horticulture and intensive animal keeping.”

I am concerned that the above requirements will add to development costs as both councils and individuals will be forced to engage expensive consultants to prepare the reports. A hydrological report will no doubt be expensive and it may be difficult to engage a suitable person. This is an SA Water responsibility and should not be offloaded onto private individuals.

Farmers or people wanting to commence intensive animal or horticulture will generally not have the expertise to prepare a farm/site management plan. This will mean they will have to source a consultant. Another financial impost.

Managing Our Resources – Page 27 – C.3 **“Innovative water use practices and technologies are continually adopted”** needs to be encouraged by way of financial incentives and grant funding.

Investing in Our Resources – Page 13 - C.3 Coast and Marine **“Stormwater management plans need to be developed that consider maximising the opportunities of capture, treatment and reuse of stormwater.”**

In the Plan the reuse of stormwater is promoted. However if we are to be truly serious about harnessing and reusing stormwater significant more funding needs to be provided to assist local government. The LGA signed an agreement for the State Government to contribute \$4m per year toward stormwater management across the whole state. This is not sufficient and not does include reuse requirements which add a considerably higher extra cost to any project.

Tulka residents expressed an interest in being able to reuse the waste water in their toilets and gardens when a Community Water Management Scheme (CWMS) is built. However the cost of bringing the water to an acceptable standard for such a small community will apparently rule out the possibility of reuse. I understand the consultants estimate that it will cost a \$1000 per household per year to recycle the waste water to an acceptable standard so it can be used in their gardens and toilets. This is more than double the ‘normal’ CWMS annual household fee. In an area which does not have a reticulated water system this is disappointing.

Investing in Our Resources – Page 20 –**“Supporting future farming systems on Eyre Peninsula”**.

The future of farming is jeopardised by the lack of support from the State Government. There is appears to be a swing away from encouraging agriculture. PIRSA and Rural Solutions have been degraded and I fear for the future of Minnipa Agricultural Centre.

We should be capitalising on our world class dry land farming at Minnipa Agricultural Centre and fishing and aquaculture at Lincoln Marine Science Centre.

The Minnipa Agricultural Centre (MAC) is crucial to ensure broadacre farming sector in SA prospers. A switch in research focus from technology to a world class public plant breeding business using all forms of breeding techniques as a means of maintaining the sustainability of farmers in SA should be investigated. I believe overseas students could also be encouraged.

The CSIRO or universities should do the detailed laboratory/glasshouse studies on the effects of climate change on plants/animals eg rising CO2 levels. This is the base line in depth scientific work as effects would be then used to adapt our farming practices and breeding to climate change. Places like MAC are needed to demonstrate or extend how those findings are to be adopted in the farming system. I understand that a lot of what is done at MAC (eg varietal testing) is looking at adaptation to climate change and risk anyway. The funding merry-go-round now needs a climate change flavour to help attract funding and to survive.

However we can have all the adaptive powers and strategies in place but if returns do not increase and costs remain at current levels then profitability will be the straw that breaks the farming sustainability not climate change.

SAFF is regarded as the voice of the farming community by the Government. However the majority of farmers who contact my office regarding a variety of issues are not members and are in fact quite critical of the organisation. The agriculture sector needs a lead organisation. The development of a new farm organisation or greater participation in SAFF to effect the necessary management/direction changes should be encouraged as part of the sustainability of the sector. Perhaps a lower fee for smaller farmers would help raise the membership numbers and relevance of SAFF.

Investing in Our Resources - Page 26 – Second paragraph **“The Board’s ability to deliver outcomes is constrained at any point in time by funding availability”**.

This will continue to be an issue and the Board needs to be mindful that the people paying the levy are the volunteers they are seeking to assist them with their on-ground activities. It seems to me city people should pay a much higher levy than country ones to take this into account.

The current funding differential between Port Lincoln and Whyalla property owners and country property owners is inequitable. I appreciate the board is constrained however it is blatantly unfair because many of the areas are enjoyed and appreciated by everyone, particularly city residents.

State of Our Resources – Page 164 - 7.6.3 Industry – **“Shipping and the discharge of ballast water can impact on water quality in the major ports....”**

In 2000 I invited three scientists to Port Lincoln for a conference on marine pests as I was concerned about the possible adverse impact of foreign organisms from ballast water and from fouling on the bottom of ships to our local fishing and aquaculture industries. Marine Biologist Dick Martin from the Centre for Research on Introduced Species in Hobart, a division of the CSIRO, Dr Frances B Michaelis from Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry Adelaide Invasive Marine Species Program and Maritime Environmental Scientist Lynn McIlwain addressed the conference and also appeared before members of State Parliament.

There are a number of Federal bodies, including CSIRO researching marine organisms. It is such an important issue we need to be kept in the loop. This may be something the Board could investigate and involve Lincoln Marine Science Centre.

SA Freight Council’s *Transport & Logistics Systems & Infrastructure to Support Regional Communities* Report on Page 22 states that *“the lack of a waste liquids receival and storage facility in Port Lincoln leads to a necessity to travel to Whyalla to access facilities in that town (with an associated cost of travel), and encourage illegal dumping.”*

I wrote a letter of support for such a facility in 2004 but a facility is still to be built. Port Lincoln City Council would have more information.

State of Our Resources – Page 168 – **“There are a number of locations in the region where septic tank discharge/overflow could pose a threat to marine habitats”.**

Where? – the sites should be identified and the Board should work with the Local Government to ensure they are able to access Catchment Water Management Scheme (CWMS) funding.

State of Our Resources - Page 171 - **“Acid sulphate soils are potentially present throughout most low-lying coastal regions in South Australia”.**

The Coastal Conservation Zone in the recent Ceduna Council PAR included extensive areas of possible acid sulphate soils. Yet information from the Department of Water, Land, Biodiversity and Conservation data and other sources indicates that there has been limited field inspection and therefore inadequate ‘real’ data available regarding the actual existence or extent of acid sulphate soils on Eyre Peninsula. It is inconceivable that vast areas of coastal land appear to have been annexed from future development using this methodology. The attendees at workshops for this and prior strategies all agreed that low lying areas of mangroves and samphire swamps would

be part of a conservation zone. However what scientific evidence is available to justify 'locking up' land outside of these areas without proper field inspection? I believe this is an issue that the Board could pursue if suitable funding is available.

State of Our Resources – Page 165 – 7.7 **South Australian marine park program.** The introduction of the marine parks is going to impact greatly on our community. We have 11 of the 19 parks in our region. I am concerned that once again the NRM levy is going to be seen as a possible way of paying for the management of this programme. I am also concerned about how the Marine Parks Program is being promoted as a means of preserving fish stocks yet the Marine Parks Manager Chris Thomas is quoted in the Border Watch on 11 February 2009 that “the purpose of marine parks is not to manage fisheries – that is what the Fisheries Management Act 2007 is for”.

We have an opportunity to do something unique and world class on Eyre Peninsula because we have so much more to start with than many places and we can learn from the mistakes and successes of others.

It is up to all Governments - Federal, State and Local along with their Departments and all other bodies concerned to lead the way with distinct delineation of their responsibilities and fair cost sharing for all the people in our State. Account must be taken of the **considerable volunteer work** undertaken by smaller regional populations. On Eyre Peninsula - SA Water, the Natural Resource Management Board and the Eyre Regional Development Board working together with local communities and their Councils really can **make a difference**.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Liz Penfold', written in a cursive style.

Mrs. Liz Penfold MP
Member for Flinders