

Spe	ng No. ecial eting	Meeting Minutes	WA Trustees Building, L2, 13 St Georges Tce Board Room @	
30/08/17			8:00am	
		Attendees		
EPRG – A Emma Yu Regional	ien – CRCWSC Manager Urich – Monash	Shelley Shepherd – New WAter Ways Inc. Giles Pickard – City of Subiaco Carolyn Oldam – UWA Nicholas Deeks – GHD	Antonietta Torre – DWER/CRCWSC EPRG Ben Harvey – Dept. of Planning Greg Ryan – Landcorp Emma Monk – DBCA	
		Apologies		
Greg Claydon – DWER/CRCWSC Board – Inaugural Chair Max Hipkins – City of Nedlands Joanne Woodbridge– EMRC Ajay Shah – KBR		Matt Hipsey – UWA Bruce Young – Spatial Property Mike Mouritz	Sergey Volotovski – Water Corporation Neil Burbridge – City Of Armadale Anas Ghoudani – UWA/CRCWSC Peter Davies - UWA	
em No.	Agenda Topic	•	A	
1.	Welcome & Apologies The acting Chair opened the meeting at 8am and welcomed meeting attendees.			
2.	Summary of findings from IRP3 and IRP4 meetings			
	A meeting was held between the PSC members from IRP3 and IRP4 which led onto a conversation with Chris Chesterfield. It was agreed that IRP4 is on track and heading in the right direction. Chris Chesterfield cleared up some of the uncertainty around IRP3 scope, timelines, budget, and role of PSC. Shelley Shepherd offered to develop a draft proposal for IRP3.			

	proposal for IRP3.	
3.	Discussion of TAPs including its integration with other IRPs etc	
	 <u>List of concerns/ WAs Business Requirements of the TAPs:</u> A key servicing strategy in WA is the irrigation of POS with locally supplied groundwater. Furthermore, stormwater management systems in many areas must also be designed to interact with subsurface water (groundwater) flows (both quality and quantity). TAPS must acknowledge these conditions/opportunities and incorporate consideration of GW/SW interactions and servicing opportunities in the following areas: Total water cycle assessment Centralised versus decentralised servicing/supply strategies 	



Item No.	Agenda Topic	
	 Any T1 components within the model that doesn't currently address gw/sw interactions and decentralized systems- Eg Urban metabolism doesn't take decentralized gw resources Outputs from 3rd party models that do address gw/sw interaction effectively (PRAMS, UNDO) should be brought in as a priority under the TAPs budget and not rely on external funding Must use something other than MUSIC in swan coastal plain in WA 	
	 Some things in TAP3 need to be in TAP2 and vice versa. This can be addressed by simplified models that can feed into each other in the following areas: Centralised versus decentralised servicing and supply B2.4 Hydrology and nutrient transport processes in groundwater surface water system should also be in TAP 3 	
	 WSC Toolkit modules must be able to : Input alternately sourced spatial or temporal data software other than music talk to commonly used software packages allow other tools to interface operability for WA 	
	 Need to integrate all IRPs (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) into TAPS There is a strong preference for "soft handshake" options for each of the toolkit modules so that inputs can be clearly defined and provided through other means/models. Also consider the need/opportunity for development of additional model interfaces. Ideally start with commonly used model (eg ARR, UNDO) and interface into TAPS. In addition there needs to be the budget to interface these models upfront although the impact on the overall program needs to also be considered. Must ensure long term lifespan of TAPs through maintenance and update of tools through appropriate commercialisation process. Discussion of TAPs with project lead – Christian Urich 	
4.		
	 Discussion of TAPs with project lead – Christian Urich Hypothetically TAPS can do what we want given sufficient time and budget It is possible to break the "solid link" between Dance 4 water and music. Hence it can use other software outputs as inputs into TAPs Will not fund new models but will seek to integrate existing models Will undertake at least one case study from WA, Vic and Qld. May include case studies from IRP3 and 4 (and maybe 5) to refine the components. Long term commercialisation will be through CRC committee or alternatively e-water or similar organisation. Responsibilities for maintaining TAPs will be clarified through the delivery of the project Will have 2 day per week research assistant starting soon whose role can focus on case studies Training budget for TAPS is through both TAPS and research adoption and can be supported by the research assistant Matt Hipsey will play a key role for overseeing the various TAPS and incorporating the WA context There may be potential to shift budget according to priorities that emerge from detailed project planning. The current budget line items are "suggestions" or an overall framework, with scope for change in emphasis (eg interface with groundwater might be able to be swapped with urban metabolism) 	



Item No.	Agenda Topic	
	 No point having groundwater model inputs if the components in the model don't deal with groundwater Detailed proposals will go to the executive in the next two months. They don't need to go through board because the overall budget is already approved. There is budget set aside to integrate new knowledge from IRPs into the TAPS (eg. economic evaluation model, IRP3 city shaping platform, etc.) 	
5.	Other business – none Acting chair left for another appointment at 9:55	
6.	Close: the meeting closed at 10:05 am by the Regional Manager who thanked everyone for their attendance.	

Actions	Description	Who	When
1.	WRAP to provide detail on currently known limitations or difficulties of application of existing TAPS to WA conditions to Nicholas Deeks, Giles Pickard and Matt Hipsey.	All	Ongoing
2.	WRAP to recommend that the TAPs project proposal incorporates an item in each TAP project to review the current level of integration of GW issues into the particular tool/product. This should be someone with software development skills (eg Kelly Norris, Joel Hall) as well as a strong understanding of WA hydrology.	All	ASAP
3.	WRAP to recommend a case study which can be used for beta testing of current TAPs. This should be an existing project so that results of application of the TAPs can be compared with known outcomes. This project could also explore and highlight gaps in the TAPs re consideration of groundwater (including servicing and surface water iterations). Suggestions include Wungong (which has a benefit of re-engaging with MRA) or Byford, as both have pre and post development monitoring information.	All	ASAP
4.	TAPS PSC and Christian to provide detailed proposals to WRAP for comment prior to submission to executive within 2 months.	Christian Urich and Nicholas Deeks, Giles Pickard and Matt Hipsey.	October
5.	All to provide suggestions for additional representatives on the project groups for TAP2 and TAP3 if required. Currently Giles and Nic (TAP2) and Matt (TAP3 and overall).	All	ASAP



Actions	Description	Who	When
6.	Optimise opportunities for IRP3 & 4 case studies to test TAPs. This is built into both project proposals. Will need transparent scopes/budgets to allocate clear responsibilities for budget expenditure and delivery.	Shelley Shepherd, Ben Harvey, Greg Ryan and Geoffrey London	Ongoing
7.	Nicholas and Ant to provide linkages from IRP5 with TAPs. Consider opportunities to leverage testing of TAP at Brabham (IRP5 case study).	Nicholas Deeks Antonietta Torre	Ongoing
8.	All to think about the value of the urban metabolism model as a component in TAPs acknowledging it is already embedded in IRP4. Then communicate this via the PSC to Christian.	All	ASAP
9.	Identify opportunities for knowledge transfer and training/testing of beta versions and refined modules in WA. Budget exists for at least 1 workshop per year in WA.	Christian Urich	Ongoing
10.	 Christian to consider a process for integrating WA conditions into TAPs. Options are (and are recommended to include) all of the below: a) Utilise Matt Hipsey and existing PSC members – Giles Pickard and Nicholas Deeks (insufficient on its own) to provide comment at SC meetings b) Bring TAPS team over to Perth for intensive GW TAPs discussions to showcase the models currently being used (e.g. PRAMS) and consider opportunities for hard integration or "soft handshake" approaches with existing models. c) Provide a project resource (action b above) through either: i. dedicated resources for TAP2 and TAP3 and relevant individual components within TAP2 and 3 to consider groundwater surface water interactions; or ii. employ a dedicated gw surface water interactions person with a holistic view over all interactions across TAPs 	Christian Urich	ASAP