



# Great Lakes Water Quality Improvement Plan Wallis, Smiths and Myall Lakes



Cover photos (clockwise from top left): Signing Statements of Joint Intent (K Meares), Smiths Lake (A Staniland) and off-stream watering (A Fardell).

#### **Great Lakes Water Quality Improvement Plan**

Copyright © 2009

This publication is copyright. You may download, display, print and reproduce this material in an unaltered form only for your personal use or for non-commercial use within your organisation. To copy, adapt, publish, distribute or commercialise any of this publication you will need to seek permission from Great Lakes Council.

Great Lakes Council PO Box 450 Forster NSW 2428

Citation: Great Lakes Council 2009, Great Lakes Water Quality Improvement Plan: Wallis, Smiths and Myall Lakes, Forster, NSW

Acknowledgements are presented in alphabetical order

#### Authors:

| lon Armotrong     | (Datkin Malkardan Appagiates)                                 |
|-------------------|---|
|                   |   |
| Craig Aspinall    | (Hunter-Central Rivers Catchment Management Authority)        |
| Pam Batkin        | (Batkin Walkerden Associates)                                 |
| Peter Beale       | (Department of Primary Industries)                            |
| Mat Bell          | (Great Lakes Council)   |
| Naomi Brydon      | (Integrated Catchment Assessment and                          |
|                   | Management (iCAM) Centre, The Australian National University) |
| Victoria Coleman  | (Independent Sustainability Consultant)                       |
| Jocelyn Dela-Cruz | (Department of Environment and Climate Change)                |
| Robert Gillespie  | (Consultant)  |
| Brendan Haine     | (Department of Environment and Climate Change)                |
| Rebecca Kelly     | (Integrated Catchment Assessment and                          |
|                   | Management (iCAM) Centre, The Australian National University) |
| April McKay       | (Great Lakes Council)   |
| Kate Meares       | (Great Lakes Council)   |
| Wendy Merritt     | (Integrated Catchment Assessment and                          |
|                   | Management (iCAM) Centre, The Australian National University) |
| Peter Scanes      | (Department of Environment and Climate Change)                |
| Mike Smith        | (Great Lakes Council)   |
| Prudence Tucker   | (Great Lakes Council)   |
| Gerard Tuckerman  | (Great Lakes Council)   |
| Greg Walkerden    | (Batkin Walkerden Associates)                                 |
| Tony Weber        | (BMT WBM Ptv Ltd)   |
| 5                 |   |

#### DISCLAIMER

The information contained within this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing (August 2008). However, because of advances in knowledge, users are reminded of the need to ensure the information they rely upon is current and accurate.

The views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and contributors, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Australian Government or the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts or the Minister for Climate Change and Water.

The Great Lakes Water Quality Improvement Plan was produced through The Coastal Catchments Initiative, an Australian Government-funded project with contributions from Great Lakes Council, and the Department of Environment and Climate Change.

#### Acknowledgements

Presented in alphabetical order

#### **Reviewers / Advisors**

### **Advisory Committee**

| tegy) |
|-------|
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |
|       |

#### **Rural Management Practices Technical Group**

| Peter Beale       | (Department of Primary Industries)                     |
|-------------------|--|
| Geoff LeMessurier | (Hunter-Central Rivers Catchment Management Authority) |
| Albert Mullen     | (Sustainable Grazing Officer)                          |
| Danny Norris      | (Department of Primary Industries)                     |
| Les Roberts       | (Karuah Great Lakes Landcare group)                    |
| Stacey Tyack      | (Great Lakes Council)                                  |

#### Lake Use and Pollution Control Workshop participants / contributors

| - |                   |   |
|---|-------------------|---|
|   | Wayne Burgess     | (Great Lakes Council)                             |
|   | Scott Carter      | (Department of Primary Industries)                |
|   | Brett Currie      | (Greater Taree City Council)                      |
|   | Tim Gippel        | (Department of Primary Industries)                |
|   | Greg Golby        | (Wallis Lake Fisherman)                           |
|   | Malcolm Hunter    | (Great Lakes Council)                             |
|   | Richard McEvilly  | (Port Stephens Great Lakes Marine Park Authority) |
|   | Gary Mead         | (Great Lakes Council)                             |
|   | Brett Ryan        | (Maritime Authority)                              |
|   | Anthony Sciacca   | (Oyster industry representative)                  |
|   | Robyn Shelley     | (Great Lakes Council)                             |
|   | Gerard Tuckerman  | (Great Lakes Council)                             |
|   | Steve Verdich     | (Oyster industry representative)                  |
|   | Tony Woodford     | (Maritime Authority)                              |
|   | Robert Williamson | (Maritime Authority)                              |
|   | Anthony Zammit    | (NSW Food Authority)                              |
|   |                   |   |

#### WSUD external group

| Garry Beisser               | (G&A Beisser)  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Hugh Cross                  | (Hunter Councils)                                      |
| Bill Donohoe                | (Badcock & Brown Residential Land Partners)            |
| Georg Fiebig                | (Pacific Blue Design)                                  |
| David Green                 | (Hunter-Central Rivers Catchment Management Authority) |
| Jacquie Keats               | (Great Lakes Environment Association)                  |
| Bob Lander                  | (Tattersall Surveyors)                                 |
| Bill Sarkis / Willander Ooi | (Winten Property Group)                                |
| Gavin Maberley-Smith        | (Coast Plan Consulting)                                |
| lan Sercombe                | (Great Lakes Ecollective)                              |
| Mike Sharpin                | (Department of Environment and Climate Change)         |
| Michael Summers             | (Lidbury, Summers & Whiteman)                          |
|                             |  |

#### WSUD internal group Brian Brooker

(Great Lakes Council)

| Wayne Burgess /              |                              |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Robyn Shelley / Alan Baldwin | (Great Lakes Council)        |
| Roger Busby                  | (Great Lakes Council)        |
| Bruce Byatt                  | (Greater Taree City Council) |
| Alex Caras                   | (Great Lakes Council)        |
| Ajith De Alwis               | (Great Lakes Council)        |
| Steve Glendenning            | (Great Lakes Council)        |
| lan Greenham                 | (Great Lakes Council)        |
| Brendan Guiney               | (MidCoast Water)             |
| Kumar Kuruppu                | (Great Lakes Council)        |
| Greg Pitt / Mike Keegan      | (Great Lakes Council)        |
| Garry Schultz                | (Greater Taree City Council) |
| Prudence Tucker              | (Great Lakes Council)        |
| Gerard Tuckerman             | (Great Lakes Council)        |
| Graeme Watkins               | (MidCoast Water)             |
|                              |                              |

#### Management Systems group (Adaptive Management, Institutional Arrangements, Financial Strategy)

Brett Currie Jeff Palmer Prudence Tucker Gerard Tuckerman Graeme Watkins Brendan Guiney / David McKellar (Greater Taree City Council) (Hunter-Central Rivers Catchment Management Authority) (Great Lakes Council) (Great Lakes Council) (MidCoast Water)

(MidCoast Water)

#### Landholder Reference Group

Steve Atkins Kay Bartlett Art Brown Norm Cunningham Andy Gilbert Trevor McBride Bill Phair Win Rae Les Roberts David Whamond

#### **Other reviewers**

| April McKay       |
|-------------------|
| Andrew Staniland  |
| Isabelle Strachan |

(Great Lakes Council) (Great Lakes Council) (Great Lakes Council)

#### Community groups who provided input during WQIP development Bunyah Landcare

**Dvers Crossing Landcare** Forster University of the 3rd Age Wallis Lake Fishermen's Co-operative Getaway Luxury Houseboats Great Lakes Coastal Land Management Network Hawks Nest / Tea Gardens Progress Association Karuah Great Lakes Landcare Myall Koala and Environment Support Group Myall River landholders Nabiac Landcare Wallis Lake oyster growers Pindimar Bundabah Community Association Smiths Lake Estuary Management Committee Smiths Lake Landcare Wallis Catchment landholders and landholder survey participants Myall Catchment landholders Wallis Lake Estuary Management Committee Wallis Lake Catchment Implementation Committee

#### Project and research teams

#### Great Lakes Council (Project coordination and development)

| Richard Henry   | (Assistant Project Manager) |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Kate Meares     | (Project Assistant)         |
| Mike Smith      | (GIS Officer)               |
| Prudence Tucker | (Project Coordinator)       |

#### Department of Environment and Climate Change (Catchment and estuary research and modelling)

| Max Carpenter     | (Environmental Technician)                    |
|-------------------|---|
| Geoff Coade       | (Senior Scientist – Estuary processes)        |
| Ed Czobik         | (Senior Chemist)                              |
| Jocelyn Dela-Cruz | (Senior Scientist – Catchment processes)      |
| Katelyn Edge      | (Environmental Assistant)                     |
| Brendan Haine     | (Scientist – Catchment and estuary processes) |
| April McKay       | (Environmental Assistant)                     |
| Adam McSorley     | (Environmental Technician)                    |
| Jamie Potts       | (Senior Scientist – Estuary processes)        |
| Brian Sanderson   | (Senior Scientist – Estuary modeller)         |
| Peter Scanes      | (Project and Team Manager)                    |
| Renelle Watson    | (Scientist – Catchment processes)             |
| Yi Lu             | (Scientist – Catchment processes)             |
|                   |   |

#### ANU: iCAM (Decision Support System development)

| Naomi Brydon   | (Research Assistant) |
|----------------|----------------------|
| Natasha Herron | (Research Fellow)    |
| Rebecca Kelly  | (Research Fellow)    |
| Peter Manger   | (Software Developer) |
| Wendy Merritt  | (Research Fellow)    |
| Kirien Whan    | (Research Assistant) |
|                |                      |

# Batkin Walkerden Associates (Management systems, pollution control systems, offset scheme scoping, Water Sensitive Urban Design Strategy)

| Pam Batkin     | (General Manager)         |
|----------------|---------------------------|
| Greg Walkerden | (Environmental Manager)   |
| Ian Armstrong  | (Environmental Scientist) |

#### Department of Primary Industries (Landholder survey, literature review, nutrient budgets)

| Peter Beale    |
|----------------|
| Kim Billingham |
| Tina Dalby     |

(District Agronomist) (Researcher) (Researcher) Roy Laurie

(Researcher)

#### BMT WBM (Urban stormwater modelling)

Tony Weber Tony McAlister Mark Wainwright (Manager, Water Quality) (Director, Water and Environment) (Associate)

# Gillespie Economics (Environmental economics) Robert Gillespie (Consultant)

(Consultant)[pt1]

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Wallis Lake, Smiths Lake and Myall Lakes and their catchments are located on the Mid North Coast of New South Wales. These lakes are the subject of this Water Quality Improvement Plan (WQIP).

The ecological significance of these lakes and their catchments have long been recognised at local, state, national and international levels as documented in the relevant estuary and catchment management plans. Formal recognition of ecological values varies across the area and includes national park estate (including the Port Stephens–Great Lakes Marine Park), international migratory bird agreements such as Japan–Australia Migratory Bird Agreement (JAMBA) and China–Australia Migratory Bird Agreement (CAMBA), and recognition of wetlands of national and international importance including Ramsar listing for the Myall Lakes.

This plan further recognises the significance of these systems, drawing on new research, modelling and community engagement to identify a range of rehabilitation, protection and management support actions to protect and support (and where required, restore) the ecological health of these systems.

In 2005, the Australian Government provided funding to Great Lakes Council through the Coastal Catchments Initiative (CCI) to undertake research and develop this WQIP. The aims of the project were to:

- identify the specific levels of nutrients and sediments that are required to provide conditions for a healthy lake ecology and environmental values desired by the community,
- identify the best way to manage activities to reduce key pollutant loads entering the lakes
- review pollution control and faecal coliform management systems as they pertain to the management and protection of the lakes.

The WQIP has been developed for practitioners and catchment / estuary management groups. It is divided into three parts:

#### PART 1: CCI planning process

Provides a background to the Coastal Catchments Initiative and the process of developing the WQIP

#### PART 2: Individual lake Water Quality Improvement Plan actions

- Wallis Lake research results, ecological targets, catchment management actions and associated costs for the Wallis Lake catchment
- Smiths Lake research results, ecological targets, catchment management actions and associated costs for the Smiths Lake catchment

 Myall Lakes – research results, targets, catchment management actions and associated costs for the Myall Lakes catchment.

#### PART 3: Implementation framework

Covers detailed management and support actions that are to be used to implement the plan across all three lakes, covering rural land, rural residential and urban land, lake use, pollution control systems, institutional arrangements, and adaptive management.[NB2]

#### Developing the Water Quality Improvement Plan

The WQIP has been developed in partnership with agencies, industry groups and the community. The focus of the planning process was to provide opportunities for capacity building and joint learning with stakeholders, as well as create opportunities to build awareness within the general community about water quality issues and catchment management. The engagement of stakeholders in developing the WQIP, and the nature and level of their involvement, has been summarised below.

#### Table 0.1. [DG3] Stakeholder engagement in WQIP development

| Stakeholders engaged  | Nature of engagement   |
|---|--|
| Advisory Committee  | A total of 25 people representing 20 groups were engaged to provide strategic input to the CCI.<br>There were 17 meetings held to allow information exchange between members and the project<br>where decisions were made on the strategies to include in the WQIP   |
| Rural Management<br>Practice Technical<br>Committee           | This was a committee of catchment management practitioners with landholder representation to inform the rural part of the project. Between three and 16 members attended 25 meetings, workshops and field visits to provide input on rural management actions to include in the Farm Scale Action Plan.  |
| Landholder Reference<br>Group                                 | This was a group of landholders from across the project area formed to provide on-ground input to rural management ideas in association with the Rural Management Practice Technical Committee. Two workshops with this group of six landholders helped to inform the Farm Scale Action Plan, ensuring that the recommendations in the plan were implementable and practical.  |
| Individual landholders<br>and landcare groups                 | A total of 55 landholders completed surveys, and several landholders allowed research to be conducted on their properties to better inform the rural part of the plan. Many of these landholders also provided direct feedback on management ideas at workshops, as did several members of local landcare groups.  |
| General community –<br>groups and individuals                 | A total of 175 interested people (representing 16 groups) helped review the environmental values of the three lakes and provide general suggestions. There were 62 community members who reviewed and suggested catchment management strategies at workshops. A total of 230 people were provided with a presentation on the CCI at two information sessions. Also, the general public received information through the media. |
| Internal Water Sensitive<br>Urban Design<br>stakeholder group | Between 10 and 14 officers from Great Lakes Council and MidCoast Water attended four internal working group meetings to help inform urban actions in the WQIP.   |
| External Water<br>Sensitive Urban Design<br>stakeholder group | Between seven and 14 stakeholders from building, architecture, design and planning companies attended three meetings to ensure the recommendations in the plan for urban areas were implementable and practical from an industry perspective.  |
| Management Systems group                                      | Between five and nine officers from Great Lakes and Greater Taree councils, and MidCoast Water, attended three meetings to provide input on the types of systems needed to ensure the recommended actions would be implemented.  |
| Other government agencies and groups                          | Ten agency stakeholders attended a full-day workshop to review current pollution control systems. A total of 23 presentations on the CCI were made to other agencies, boards and committees.   |

In developing the WQIP, the Great Lakes Coastal Catchments Initiative had three main components:

- water quality research to identify the current status of the systems, and develop catchment and estuarine models of sediment and nutrient loads to the Myall, Smiths and Wallis lakes
- identifying rural, urban, rural residential and management support actions to reduce sediment and nutrient loads entering the lakes
- a decision-support system to assist with decision-making in relation to how activities on the land will impact on water quality and ecology of the lakes.

#### Water Quality Improvement Plan summary

The Water Quality Improvement Plan focuses on algae concentration and water clarity as indicators of the estuaries' ecological condition. These parameters were selected, as increased algal biomass and deceased water clarity can lead to harmful algal blooms, loss of habitat such as seagrass, reduced fish abundance, loss of higher predators (e.g. birds, dolphins, sharks), and overall loss of biodiversity and estuarine function. The WQIP used abundance of microalgae (chlorophyll-a), water clarity (turbidity, Secchi depth) and the extent of seagrass as the primary indicators of estuarine condition. Water clarity and chlorophyll-a concentrations were considered to be the appropriate measures of ecological condition – rather than water quality parameters – because they were direct measures of ecosystem status and were the only indicators of condition linked to catchment disturbance.

To determine the actions required to maintain or improve the ecological health of the systems, the current status of the lakes and the river estuaries were identified and ranked in relation to their relative conservation values. Conservation values were established based on the chlorophyll-a concentration recorded in the field. Three levels were established:

- 1. High conservation value
- 2. Moderately disturbed
- 3. Heavily impacted.

#### Current condition of the lakes and ecological condition targets

#### Wallis Lake

The **southern end of Wallis Lake** is in a *High conservation value* or near-pristine state. It supports a wide variety of seagrass, healthy algae and brackish water plant (macrophyte) communities to a depth in excess of 3 m. All these benthic (bottom-dwelling) plant communities are dependent on clear, clean water with very low nutrient loads. These near-pristine conditions have allowed the continued survival of the ecologically important seagrass and macrophyte communities, with their associated biodiversity (including the increasingly threatened estuarine sponges found to be present). The long-term target identified for the southern end of the lake was to maintain its current near-pristine condition.

Localised conservation value issues were identified in a number of areas.

In **Coomba Bay area**, chlorophyll-a measurement showed elevated concentrations when compared with the southern bays of the main Wallis Lake body. A large gully estimated to be up to 300 m long, 3–4 m wide and 2 m deep – which resulted from a failed dam – exported a large volume of sediment into the waters of the bay. In this event, seagrass communities were killed due to burial and the resuspension of the deposited sediments that caused long-term turbidity. The impact of a seemingly small failure in catchment management emphasises the scale of risk that can stem from localised catchment conditions. The long-term target identified for Coomba Bay is to improve its current condition to more closely resemble *High conservation value* conditions. This means chlorophyll-a levels need to be reduced by 41%.

The **Pipers Creek and Pipers Bay** area is the receiving waters for the medium-density urban and light industrial developments on the eastern side of the Wallis Lake, and includes the majority of the Forster urban area. Chlorophyll-a concentrations in Pipers Creek were among the highest measured in the system, with the average value five to six times greater than values expected for this type of environment. The research indicated that this part of Wallis Lake is significantly degraded, with extensive macroalgae growth recorded on the seagrass. This area was identified as in the lower end of the range for a *Slightly to moderately disturbed* ecosystem value. The long-term target for the Pipers Bay area is to improve its current modified condition to more closely resemble a *High conservation value* condition. This means chlorophyll-a levels need to be reduced by 50%. This will also provide a degree of protection to the main Wallis Lake body because during high-flow periods, pollutants flow from Pipers Bay towards the southern bays of Wallis Lake.

The **lower Wallis Lake estuary** (comprising the lower reaches of the Wallamba, Wang Wauk and Coolongolook Rivers; the lake entrance; and the eastern and western channels), despite receiving much of the catchment input of pollutants from the major rivers, was determined to be generally in good condition. This area is well flushed (i.e. there is significant tidal exchange with the ocean) when compared to other parts of the system. The lower Wallis Lake estuary was determined to be in the lower category of *High conservation value*. Given that the lower estuary is where most of the aquaculture and lake-based recreation occurs, the long-term target is to maintain and, where possible, improve on current conditions to provide a buffer against possible future increases in pollutants, including those arising from single, localised events.

While the lower reaches of the Wallamba, Wang Wauk and Coolongolook rivers have good ecological condition, the **middle reach of the Wallamba river estuary** has an ecological condition that is *Slightly to moderately disturbed*. The **middle reach of the Coolongolook and Wang Wauk river estuary** are also *Slightly to moderately disturbed*, although they are in better condition than the middle reach of the Wallamba River. The adopted long-term target for the middle reaches of the Wallamba, Coolongolook and Wang Wauk River estuaries was to improve from their current modified condition to more closely resemble *High conservation value* conditions. This requires a long-term reduction in chlorophyll-a by 21% in the Wallamba River, 14% in the Coolongolook River and 2.7% in the Wang Wauk River.

- X-

The **upper reach of the Wallamba river estuary** has an ecological condition that is *Slightly to moderately disturbed*. The degree of impact is higher than the middle reaches of the river. The plan recommends that the upper reaches of the Wallamba river estuary be managed to improve it from its current modified condition to more closely resemble *High conservation value* conditions. The long-term goal requires a 30% reduction in chlorophyll-a.

#### Smiths Lake

The current ecological condition of Smiths Lake was identified as of *High conservation value*. The ecological condition target identified for Smiths Lake is to maintain its high conservation value and, where possible, improve on current conditions to provide a buffer against possible future increases in pollutants or impacts of lake use activities.

#### Myall Lakes

**Myall Lake and Boolambayte Lake** both have a good ecosystem quality and were considered to be of *High conservation value*. **Two Mile Lake**, while generally in good condition, has experienced higher levels of chlorophyll-a and nuisance algal growth, and appeared to have lost some deepwater plant communities at its southern end. The adopted long-term targets for Myall Lake and Boolambayte Lake are to maintain and, where possible, improve on current conditions to provide a buffer against possible future increases in pollutants. This was considered especially important, given that it is a Ramsar site (Wetland of International Importance).

**Bombah Broadwater**, in the Myall Lakes, is a *Slightly to moderately disturbed* ecosystem. The Bombah Broadwater has experienced some severe algal blooms over the past decade and the apparent loss of deepwater plant communities. The long-term target for the Bombah Broadwater is to improve its current modified condition to more closely resemble a *High conservation value* condition. This requires a 14% reduction in chlorophyll-a levels.

#### Management strategies

The strategies outlined in the WQIP targeted two specific purposes:

- to remediate existing areas of high pollutant loads, and thus reduce catchment loads and improve estuarine health
- to protect areas of high conservation status that currently provide substantial water quality and biodiversity benefits to the rivers and lake systems.

While protection actions were not expected to improve water quality as such, the plan highlights that it is essential to protect against further declines in water quality. The WQIP confirms that it is more important and less expensive to protect current values and functions than to replace them once they have been lost. Given the cost of remediation actions and the limits to their effectiveness to improve water quality at the catchment scale, the WQIP [pt4] indicates that it is essential that a range of protective actions is implemented. Protection actions identified included maintaining existing vegetation buffers and placing limits on and controlling inappropriate development. This is particularly the case for the southern end of

Wallis Lake where the unique ecological values are at risk if significant protection of current values and functions is not undertaken.

A summary of the programs identified in the WQIP is shown below. The nature of the programs is similar between lakes. However, the extent of each program varies. This variation was based largely on the ecological condition of each lake (and therefore the amount of remediation or protection actions required), dominant land uses in each catchment and the feasibility of the adoption of actions in each area.

Table 0.2. Remediation actions proposed in the Water Quality Improvement Plan.

· xiii -

| Program   | Program description  | Lakes                     | Plan<br>section |
|---|--|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Rural land  |  |                           |                 |
| Groundcover<br>management                             | The aim of this program is to improve groundcover on rural lands, thus reducing the amount of sediments and nutrients washing into the waterways. Groundcover management refers to a sustainable grazing program for landholders, and is focussed on improving groundcover management on pasture lands. It involves field days and formal workshops with experts, developing information and training material on stocking rates, formal training courses such as Prograze, a dung beetle release program, and a program of on-ground works that will assist landholders to better manage groundcover levels (including off-stream watering, solar pumps and fencing).   | Myall<br>Wallis<br>Smiths | 3.3.2           |
| Nutrient (Fertiliser)<br>management                   | Nutrient management is a component of a sustainable grazing program focussed on the appropriate application and storage of nutrients. It involves working with landholders to trial different types of fertilisers, formal training courses such as LANDSCAN, subsidising and promoting the use of soil tests, and providing assistance with interpretation of the tests so that the results can be integrated into a whole-farm plan. This program also supports a dung beetle program.<br>Additional actions related to the management of human and animal effluent include the upgrade of laneways and stock crossings.   | Myall<br>Wallis           | 3.3.2           |
| Infrastructure (Dam)<br>management                    | Infrastructure management includes the refurbishment of dams that are a water quality risk as well as decommissioning those dams that are not functioning, and potentially acting as a source of nutrients and sediments to the system. It involves working with landholders to repair dam structural problems, controlling stock access to the dam or providing an alternative stock water supply from the dam. It also involves landholder training, as well as training and accreditation of contractors.   | Myall<br>Wallis           | 3.3.2           |
| Riparian remediation                                  | However, these kinds of actions were not able to be modelled.<br>Riparian remediation programs include the rehabilitation of sites with active stream bank erosion. These sites are based on identified<br>locations in existing plans, such as rivercare plans. This program includes significant in-stream repair work for bank stabilisation and<br>fencing off the creek in identified areas.  | Myall<br>Wallis           | 3.3.2           |
| Unpaved road remediation                              | This aims to identify and seal unpaved roads in priority areas, such as creek crossings in the Smiths Lake catchment and the Crawford sub-catchment of the Myall Lakes system. This would also include installing best practice sediment and erosion control features, such as mitre drains to divert road runoff into grassed areas.  | Smiths<br>Myall           | 3.3.2           |
| Urban land  |  |                           |                 |
| Urban Mitigation<br>(Water Sensitive<br>Urban Design) | Urban mitigation includes the retrofitting of rainwater tanks supported through a program of rebates. It is recommended that the tanks are plumbed into the home to maximise the water quality benefits. It also involves an extensive program of urban retrofitting where Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) systems, such as biofiltration (including trenches, raingardens and biopods), are built into the existing urban landscape to filter the urban stormwater. For Wallis Lake, the focus areas are the catchments of Pipers Creek and Pipers Bay. In Smiths Lake, the focus is in the existing urban area. This program also involves education and capacity-building on maintenance and construction of WSUD devices, adoption of a development control plan that specifies best practice water-sensitive urban design, and associated staff training and capacity-building. It also includes investigating options for a nutrient offset scheme for the Pipers Creek / Pipers Bay area. | Wallis<br>Smiths          | 3.4.2           |
| Water Sensitive<br>Redevelopment                      | Water Sensitive Redevelopment involves the implementation of a development control plan that specifies best practice water-sensitive urban design (including biofiltration and rainwater tanks) on all redevelopments. The program of redevelopment has been estimated based on existing redevelopment rates.  | Wallis                    | 3.4.2           |

#### Table 0.3. Protection actions proposed in the Water Quality Improvement Plan.

xiv -

| Program   | Program description  | Lakes                     | Plan<br>section |
|---|--|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Rural land  |  |                           |                 |
| Wetland<br>protection                                     | Wetland protection involves the acquisition of wetlands, and undertaking management and / or rehabilitation as required (e.g. fencing, establishing property vegetation plans, management plans, reinstating natural hydrology). The program also involves assisting landholders to protect natural wetlands, with advice, training and on-ground works to control stock access. More generally, the program involves partnerships with the community, including raising the profile of wetlands and their role in providing environmental services, as well as encouraging participation in management and restoration. | Wallis<br>Myall           | 3.3.2           |
| Riparian<br>protection                                    | This program involves fencing and / or stock exclusion of areas of riparian revegetation, including off-stream watering and some planting where vegetation requires rehabilitation. It also involves establishing property vegetation plans in areas not suitable for fencing (e.g. high-slope areas).   | Myall<br>Wallis           | 3.3.2           |
| Urban land  |  |                           |                 |
| Water Sensitive<br>Development of<br>Greenfield sites     | Water- Sensitive Development of Greenfield sites involves establishing and implementing Local Environmental Plan (LEP) / Development Control Plan (DCP) provisions on Greenfield development sites in the Wallis Lake catchment. This will involve enforcing 'no net increase' in pollutants relative to the existing land use (agricultural and forest land use classifications). This program also involves establishing heads of consideration for voluntary planning agreements with developers.   | Wallis<br>Smiths<br>Myall | 3.4.2           |
| Water Sensitive<br>Redevelopment                          | Water Sensitive Redevelopment involves the implementation of a development control plan that specifies best practice water-sensitive urban design (including biofiltration and rainwater tanks) on all redevelopments. Predicted redevelopment rates in the Smiths and Myall lakes are low, and therefore in these areas it is considered a protection action.   | Smiths<br>Myall           | 3.4.2           |
| Water Sensitive<br>Urban Design<br>protection             | WSUD protection is an education and capacity-building program on stormwater management, including water-sensitive urban design and improved management of urban land. It involves workshops, field days and demonstration sites with stakeholders including the general community, business, students, and building and development industries. It involves updating plans, strategies and design guidelines (such as road guidelines), as well as resourcing a sediment and erosion control audit and training program.   | Wallis<br>Smiths<br>Myall | 3.4.2           |
| Foreshore and<br>riparian<br>management in<br>urban areas | Foreshore and riparian management in urban areas involves improving foreshore areas around Wallis and Smiths lakes through establishing site-specific management plans, education and engagement of residents surrounding foreshore areas to reduce the impact of their behaviours, and increased enforcement of environmental legislation in these areas.   | Wallis<br>Smiths          | 3.4.2           |
| Best<br>management of<br>unpaved roads                    | Best management of unpaved roads includes construction of mitre drains to divert road runoff into grassed areas, and sealing and diverting runoff away from streams particularly in the vicinity of creek crossings. The program involves mapping the location and extent of road erosion sites, and undertaking risk analysis in each sub-catchment to prioritise roads for rehabilitation or closure. A program of training and auditing contractors and council staff specific to road construction to ensure best management practices are applied will also be undertaken as part of this action.                   | Wallis<br>Smiths<br>Myall | 3.3.3           |
| Other   |  |                           |                 |
| Protect sea<br>sponge beds                                | To facilitate the protection of the unique sea sponges in Wallis Lake, identification and mapping of the location of sea sponges, and developing and implementing an action plan and case for formal protection, are required. This program also involves engaging with the community and key stakeholders to establish support for protection, as well as establishing appropriate community education and monitoring programs.   | Wallis                    | Appendix<br>2.6 |

| Program  | Program description   | Lakes                     | Plan<br>section |
|--|---|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Improved<br>management of<br>lake use activities                             | Improved management of lake use activities involves reviewing stormwater management plans to clarify the outcomes required to protect the environment and oyster growing programs to identify synergies with ecological monitoring programs (Wallis Lake). It also involves establishing memoranda of understanding with key groups of lake users, and investigating other management options such as closing boat ramps during high-flow events (Wallis Lake) and establishing markers to protect seagrass beds (all lakes). It also involves supporting actions in the Smiths Lake boating plan. In Myall Lakes, it recommends upgrading gravel boat ramps, assessing impacts of water sports and adopting no-discharge guidelines for greywater. | Wallis<br>Smiths<br>Myall | 3.5.2           |
| Improved<br>pollution control<br>systems /<br>management<br>systems          | Improved management and pollution control systems involves reviewing how water quality management, both within and between organisations, is approached. It focuses on establishing checking and review loops in key areas, such as compliance with conditions of consent, and sediment and erosion control. The program also highlights the need to embed water quality improvement actions in organisational plans to ensure the WQIP is implemented. It highlights the need to review a range of existing systems such as the fee structure for on-site sewage management, and recommends exploring alternative ways to formalise the response to complex pollution cases and strengthen cross-agency relationships and delegation.              | Wallis<br>Smiths<br>Myall | 3.7             |
| Management sup   | port actions  |                           |                 |
| Adaptive<br>Management<br>Strategy /<br>Ecological<br>monitoring<br>program  | The Adaptive Management Strategy underpins the implementation of the WQIP. It highlights the ecological, political and social uncertainties surrounding the WQIP, and identifies ways to track these and make informed management decisions during plan implementation. The ecological monitoring program outlined in the strategy involves the collection of data on ecological indicators such as chlorophyll-a, water clarity, habitat assessments on river reaches and fish sampling. The strategy also recommends a public reporting regime for the WQIP.  | Wallis<br>Smiths<br>Myall | 3.9             |
| Future<br>investigation<br>relating to the<br>Farm Scale<br>Action Plan[DG5] | Areas for investigation include riparian management, wetland management, groundcover management, farm infrastructure management, nutrient management and ways to encourage uptake of improved management practices. The findings from this research are applicable across all three catchments.   | Wallis<br>Smiths<br>Myall | 3.3.2           |

- XV -

#### Predicted ecological improvements resulting from management actions

#### Wallis Lake

Substantial reduction in chlorophyll-a concentrations would be achieved in the Pipers Bay area with full implementation of the identified actions. Chlorophyll-a concentrations can be reduced, on average, by 13% and up [DG6] to 26% for Pipers Bay; and, on average, by 3%, and up to 7% for [pt7] the upper, mid and lower estuary zones. Although substantial, these changes do not reach the target 50% reduction in chlorophyll-a identified for Pipers Bay, or the reductions identified for the upper and mid estuary.

#### Smiths Lake

The estimated feasible change in chlorophyll-a concentrations in Smiths Lake are in the order of 3.6%. This result achieves the identified target of no decline in ecological condition.

#### Myall Lakes

Reductions in chlorophyll-a concentrations of 2.4% would be achieved in the Bombah Broadwater with full implementation of the management actions identified. Smaller reductions would be achieved for the Boolambayte Lake (1.9%) and Myall Lake (1.6%). Changes do not reach the 14% reduction identified as the long-term target for Bombah Broadwater, but do achieve the target of no further decline for the Myall and Boolambayte systems.

In conclusion, these changes do not fully achieve the identified long-term targets for Pipers Bay, the upper and mid estuary of Wallis Lake, and Bombah Broadwater in the Myall Lakes.

They are, however, an important step in moving towards these outcomes and are highly important for the adoption of longer-term adaptive management. Importantly, the WQIP recommends that there be no further decline in lake condition. This objective would be achieved in all areas of Wallis, Myall and Smiths lakes through the implementation of the WQIP.

#### Costs and future funding

Funding for the WQIP urban, rural and lake use actions is critical to the success of the Plan. Sourcing funds is identified as one of the major challenges confronting the organisations and community members who are committed to implementing WQIP actions. The costs of funding the actions identified in the WQIP for each lake are summarised below.

| Lake        | Total cost of WQIP<br>implementation | Average annual cost<br>over seven years |
|-------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Wallis Lake | \$54,801,000                         | \$7,687,000                             |
| Smiths Lake | \$1,221,200                          | \$174,000                               |

\$7,153,000

\$954,000

Myall Lakes

Table 0.4. Summary of costs associated with implementing the Water Quality Improvement Plan after seven years.

Economic analysis undertaken as part of this project has shown that the benefit-cost ratio for implementing the Wallis and Myall Lakes actions is economically viable. Smiths Lake, however, did not demonstrate such a convincing response, with a benefit-cost ratio that showed the Plan is difficult to justify on the grounds of economic efficiency alone. This result is largely because Smiths Lake is currently in a *High conservation value* condition, and predicted changes in water quality under the Plan actions do not lead to benefits that are able to be feasibly estimated. Given the limitations of this analysis and the environmental values identified by the local community, it is still recommended that the WQIP actions be implemented for Smiths Lake.

Given the value of funding required to achieve the improvements in ecological condition identified in this Plan, there would need to be a collective focus on seeking funding to implement the WQIP through the development of a business plan. As funding becomes available, the approach to implementation will need to be flexible and adaptable. The potential sources of funds, their relative importance for implementing the plan and the security of funding for the particular actions have been identified and are discussed within the WQIP.

Great Lakes Water Quality Improvement Plan: Wallis, Smiths and Myall lakes

### CONTENTS

| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY  | vii    |
|--|--------|
| CONTENTS   | xix    |
| LIST OF APPENDICES   | xxiii  |
| LIST OF FIGURES  | xxiv   |
| LIST OF TABLES   | xxix   |
| GLOSSARY OF TERMS  | . xxxv |
| ABBREVIATIONS  | xxxix  |
| PART 1: PLANNING PROCESS – DEVELOPMENT OF THE                                  | 4      |
|  | 1      |
| 1.1 INTRODUCTION   | 1      |
| 1.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND   | 1      |
| 1.3 Project area   | 1      |
| 1.4 Project purpose  | 3      |
| 1.5 Process for developing the Water Quality Improvement Plan                  | 4      |
| 1.5.1 Stakeholder input  | 5      |
| 1.5.1.1 Engagement of the Great Lakes CCI Advisory Committee                   | 6      |
| 1512 Engaging key agencies   | 6      |
| 1.5.1.3 Engaging with the general community and industry groups                | 6      |
| 1.52 Modelling   | 7      |
| 1521 Catchment investigation and modelling                                     | 7      |
| 1.5.2.7 Estuary investigation and modelling                                    | <br>8  |
| 1.5.3 Management planning and research   | 0<br>8 |
| 1.5.3 1 Pural management actions   | ۵      |
| 1 5 3 2 Pural etakeholder input  | 3<br>Q |
| 1.5.3.3 Lithan and rural residential management actions                        |        |
| 1.5.3.5 Orban and rural residential indiagement durins                         | 1 1    |
| 1.5.2.5 Lake use strategies  | 1 1    |
| 1.5.3.5 Lake use suit alegies.   | 12     |
| 1.0.0.0 Management support actions to active water quality improvement actions | 10     |
| (plaining tools, management systems, regulators of meentive programs)          | 12     |
| 1.5.4 A Decision Support System for water quarky improvement.                  | 14     |
| 1.5.4.1 Establishing Ecological Condition 1 argets                             | 14     |
| 1.5.4.2 Testing management scenarios and determining WQIP actions              | 15     |
| 1.5.5 Water Quality Improvement Plan   | 16     |
| PART 2: INDIVIDUAL LAKE WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES        | 19     |
| 2.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 2  | 19     |
| 2.2 WATER QUALITY ISSUES   | 19     |
| 2.2.1 Land-based impacts   | 20     |
| 2.2.1.1 Ecosystem protection   | 20     |
| 2.2.1.2 Human exposure   | 22     |
| 2.2.2 Water-based impacts  | 22     |
| 2.2.2.1 Ecosystem protection   | 22     |
| 2.2.2.2 Human exposure   | 23     |
| 2.3 CATCHMENT AND ESTUARY PROCESSES  | 23     |
| 2.3.1 Catchment exports  | 24     |
| 2.3.2 In-stream processes  | 27     |
| 2.3.3 Hydrodynamic processes   | 27     |
| 2.3.3.1 Coastal lakes  | 27     |
| 2.3.3.2 River estuaries  | 28     |
| 2.3.3.3 Freshwater systems   | 30     |
| 2.3.4 Nutrient cycling and settling processes                                  | 31     |
| 2.3.5 Modelling catchment and estuary processes in the Great Lakes CCI         | 33     |
| 2.3.5.1 Catchment exports.   | 34     |

| $z. \overline{b}. \overline{c}$   | 36  |
|---|---|
| 2.3.5.3 Model limitations, process representation and scale issues  | . 37  |
| 2.3.5.4 Estimates of model reliability and reasonable assurance statements  | 38  |
| 2.4 WALLIS LAKE CATCHMENT DESCRIPTION   | 41  |
| 2.5 WALLIS LAKE – CURRENT STATE OF CATCHMENT AND ESTUARY HEALTH   | 48  |
| 2.5.1 Wallis Lake segments and rivers   | 48  |
| 2.5.2 Synthesis of research for Wallis Lake   | 49  |
| 2.5.2.1 Previous research   | 49  |
| 2.5.2.2 CCI research  | 50  |
| 2.5.2.3 Catchment management research   | 51  |
| 2.5.2.4 Urban Calchinent management research  |   |
| 2.5.2.5 Water quality in Wallis Lake  | 58  |
| 2.5.2.0 Ecology of Wallis Earco   | 62  |
| 2.5.3 1 Wallis Lake   | 66  |
| 2.5.3.2 Pipers Bay  | 67  |
| 2.5.3.3 Lower Estuary   | 70  |
| 2.5.3.4 Middle Estuary  | 71  |
| 2.5.3.5 Upper Estuary   | 71  |
| 2.5.4 Hydrodynamics   | 72  |
| 2.5.5 Description of in-stream attenuation and remobilisation processes   | . 78  |
| 2.5.6 Catchment loads and pollutant generation  | 78  |
| 2.5.7 Summary   | 81  |
| 2.6 WALLIS LAKE – SETTING TARGETS FOR WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT  | . 83  |
| 2.6.1 Using community values to help set targets  | 83  |
| 2.6.2 Ecological Condition Targets and catchment loads  | 86  |
| 2.6.2.1 Wallis Lake Ecological Condition Targets  | 88  |
| 2.6.2.2 Pipers Bay Ecological Condition Target  | 89  |
| 2.6.2.3 Lower Estuary Ecological Condition Targets  | 89  |
| 2.6.2.4 Upper Estuary Ecological Condition Target   | 90  |
| 2.6.2.6 Ecosible reductions in obleranbull a concentrations   | 90  |
| 2.6.2.7 Catchment loads   |   |
| 2.0.2.7 Gatchinent loads  | 0 <u>4</u>  |
| 2.7 WALLIS LARE - WANAGEMENT STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE ECOLOGICAL CONDITION TARGETS   |   |
| 2.7.1 Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions  | 94  |
| 2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions   | 94<br>95  |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li> <li>2.7.1.1. Description of scenarios tested</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | <i>94</i><br>95<br>100<br>112   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | <i>94</i><br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115  |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i>   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br>125  |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br><i>125</i><br>129  |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br><i>125</i><br>129<br>135   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br><i>125</i><br>129<br>135<br><i>135</i>   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br><i>125</i><br>129<br>135<br><i>135</i><br><i>135</i>   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br><i>125</i><br>129<br>135<br><i>135</i><br>135  |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br><i>125</i><br>129<br>135<br><i>135</i><br>135<br>135   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br><i>125</i><br>129<br>135<br><i>135</i><br>135<br>135   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br><i>125</i><br>129<br>135<br><i>135</i><br>135<br>135<br>135<br>136<br>136  |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br><i>125</i><br>129<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>136<br>136<br>136   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br><i>125</i><br>135<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>136<br>136<br>137<br>137   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br>125<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>136<br>136<br>137<br>137<br>140  |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br>125<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>136<br>136<br>137<br>140<br>142  |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br>125<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>136<br>136<br>137<br>140<br>142<br>142   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br>125<br>129<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>136<br>136<br>137<br>140<br>142<br>142   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br><i>118</i><br>125<br>129<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>136<br>136<br>137<br>140<br>142<br>145   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br>118<br>125<br>129<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>135<br>136<br>136<br>137<br>140<br>142<br>145<br>145   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94          95           100           112           115           118           125           129           135           135           135           136           137           140           142           145           145           145  |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 9495100112115118125129135135135136137140142145145148151   |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | $\begin{array}{c}94\\95\\ 100\\ 112\\ 115\\ 125\\ 129\\ 135\\ 135\\ 135\\ 135\\ 136\\ 136\\ 137\\ 140\\ 142\\ 145\\ 148\\ 151\\ 151\\ 151\\ 152\\ \end{array}$  |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions.</li> <li>2.7.1.1. Description of scenarios tested.</li> <li>2.7.1.2 Catchment exports.</li> <li>2.7.1.3 Estuary condition</li> <li>2.7.1.4 Costs of modelled remediation actions</li> <li>2.7.2 Summary of recommended programs for protection, remediation and management support of Wallis Lake</li> <li>2.7.3. Summary of benefit-cost analysis results for Wallis Lake Plan.</li> <li>2.8 SMITHS LAKE – CURRENT DESCRIPTION</li> <li>2.9 SMITHS LAKE – CURRENT STATE OF CATCHMENT AND ESTUARY HEALTH.</li> <li>2.9.1 Smiths Lake segments and rivers.</li> <li>2.9.2.2 CCI research.</li> <li>2.9.2.3 Catchment management research.</li> <li>2.9.2.4 Urban catchment management research.</li> <li>2.9.2.5 Water quality in Smiths Lake.</li> <li>2.9.3 Ecological condition.</li> <li>2.9.4 Hydrodynamics.</li> <li>2.9.5 Description of in-stream attenuation and remobilisation processes</li> <li>2.9.6 Catchment loads and pollutant generation.</li> <li>2.10.1 Using community values to help set targets.</li> <li>2.10.2 Ecological Condition Targets and catchment loads.</li> <li>2.11.1 SMITHS LAKE – MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE ECOLOGICAL CONDITION TARGETS.</li> <li>2.11.1.2 Catchment exports.</li> </ul>   | $\begin{array}{c}94 \\95 \\ 100 \\ 112 \\ 115 \\ 125 \\ 129 \\ 135 \\ 135 \\ 135 \\ 135 \\ 136 \\ 137 \\ 140 \\ 142 \\ 145 \\ 141 \\ 151 \\ 151 \\ 152 \\ 156 \\ 151 \\ 152 \\ 156 \\ 151 \\ 151 \\ 152 \\ 156 \\ 151 \\ 151 \\ 152 \\ 156 \\ 151 \\ 151 \\ 151 \\ 152 \\ 151 \\ 151 \\ 151 \\ 152 \\ 151 \\ 151 \\ 151 \\ 152 \\ 151$ |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | $\begin{array}{c}94 \\95 \\ 100 \\ 112 \\ 115 \\ 1125 \\ 125 \\ 135 \\ 135 \\ 135 \\ 135 \\ 136 \\ 137 \\ 140 \\ 142 \\ 145 \\ 151 \\ 152 \\ 156 \\ 159 \\ 150 \\ 15$ |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions.</li> <li>2.7.1.1. Description of scenarios tested.</li> <li>2.7.1.2 Catchment exports.</li> <li>2.7.1.3 Estuary condition</li> <li>2.7.1.4 Costs of modelled remediation actions</li> <li>2.7.2 Summary of recommended programs for protection, remediation and management support of Wallis Lake</li> <li>2.7.3 Summary of benefit-cost analysis results for Wallis Lake Plan.</li> <li>2.8 SMITHS LAKE CATCHMENT DESCRIPTION</li> <li>2.9 SMITHS LAKE – CURRENT STATE OF CATCHMENT AND ESTUARY HEALTH.</li> <li>2.9.1 Smiths Lake segments and rivers.</li> <li>2.9.2 Synthesis of research.</li> <li>2.9.2.1 Previous research.</li> <li>2.9.2.2 CCI research.</li> <li>2.9.2.3 Catchment management research.</li> <li>2.9.2.4 Urban catchment management research.</li> <li>2.9.2.5 Water quality in Smiths Lake.</li> <li>2.9.3 Ecological condition.</li> <li>2.9.4 Hydrodynamics.</li> <li>2.9.5 Description of in-stream attenuation and remobilisation processes.</li> <li>2.9.6 Catchment loads and pollutant generation.</li> <li>2.10.1 Using community values to help set targets.</li> <li>2.10.2 Ecological Condition Targets and catchment loads.</li> <li>2.11.1 Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions.</li> <li>2.11.1.1 Description of remediation and protection actions.</li> <li>2.11.1.2 Catchment exports.</li> <li>2.11.4 Costs of rural and urban remediation actions.</li> </ul> | $\begin{array}{c}94 \\95 \\ 100 \\ 112 \\ 115 \\ 1125 \\ 125 \\ 135 \\ 135 \\ 135 \\ 135 \\ 136 \\ 137 \\ 140 \\ 142 \\ 145 \\ 151 \\ 152 \\ 156 \\ 159 \\ 159 \\ 159 \\ 159 \\ 150 \\ 15$ |
| <ul> <li>2.7.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions</li></ul>  | 94<br>95<br>100<br>112<br>115<br>1125<br>1135<br>1135<br>1135<br>1135<br>1136<br>1137<br>1142<br>1145<br>1151<br>1152<br>1151<br>1152<br>1159<br>1159<br>1159   |

| 2.11.3. Summary of benefit-cost analysis results for the Smiths Lake Plan   |  |
|---|--|
| 2.12 Myall Lakes system and catchment description   | 170  |
| 2.13. MYALL LAKES – CURRENT STATE OF CATCHMENT AND ESTUARY HEALTH   |  |
| 2.13.1. Myall Lakes segments and rivers   |  |
| 2.13.2. Synthesis of research   |  |
| 2.13.2.1 Previous research  |  |
| 2.13.2.2 CCI research   | 178  |
| 2.13.2.3 Catchment management research  |  |
| 2.13.2.4 Urban catchment management research  |  |
| 2.13.2.5 Water quality in the Myall Lakes   |  |
| 2.13.2.6 Ecology in Myall Lakes   |  |
| 2.13.3. Ecological condition  | 185  |
| 2.13.4 Hydrodynamics  | 190  |
| 2.13.5 Description of in-stream attenuation and remobilisation processes  | 190  |
| 2.13.6. Catchment loads and pollutant generation  | 190  |
| 2.13.7 Summary  | 193  |
| 2.14 MYALL LAKES – SETTING TARGETS FOR WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT   |  |
| 2.14.1 Using community values to help set targets   |  |
| 2.14.2 Ecological Condition Targets and catchment loads   |  |
| 2.14.2.1 Myall Lake Ecological Condition Target   |  |
| 2.14.2.2 Boolambayte Lake Ecological Condition Target   |  |
| 2.14.2.3 Bombah Broadwater Ecological Condition Target  |  |
| 2.14.2.4 Upper Myall River Ecological Condition Target  |  |
| 2.14.2.5 Feasible reductions in chlorophyll-a concentrations  |  |
| 2.14.2.6 Catchment loads  |  |
| 2.15 Myall Lakes – Management strategies to achieve Ecological Condition Targe  | TS 203   |
| 2.15.1. Exploratory analysis of potential remediation and protection actions  |  |
| 2.15.1.1. Description of remediation and protection actions   |  |
| 2.15.1.2 Catchment exports  | 210  |
| 2.15.1.3 Estuary condition  |  |
| 2.15.1.4 Costs of modelled remediation actions  |  |
| 2.15.2 Summary of recommended programs for protection, remediation and  |  |
| management support of Myall Lakes   |  |
| 2.15.3. Summary of benefit-cost analysis results for Mvall Lakes Plan   | 229  |
|   |  |
| DADT 2 INDI EMENTATION EDAMEWOOK  |  |
| PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK   |  |
| PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK   |  |
| PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.<br>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3   | <b>233</b><br>233<br>233   |
| PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK   | <b>233</b><br>233<br>233<br>233<br>233<br>236  |
| PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK         3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3         3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY         3.2.1 Partnerships         3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes   | <b>233</b><br>233<br>233<br>233<br>236<br>237  |
| PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK         3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3         3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY         3.2.1 Partnerships         3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes         3.2.2 Learning for sustainability   | <b>233</b> 233 233 233 236 237 237 238   |
| PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.         3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.         3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.         3.2.1 Partnerships.         3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes   | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 237 238 240   |
| PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.         3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.         3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.         3.2.1 Partnerships.         3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes   | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 237 238 240 241   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 237 238 240 241 241   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 249   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 241 242 249 251   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 241 242 249 251 251   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 236 237 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 249 251 252 253   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes.</li> <li>3.2.2 Learning for sustainability.</li> <li>3.2.2.1 Building leadership and organisational capacity for sustainability.</li> <li>3.3 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN RURAL AREAS.</li> <li>3.3.1 Existing water quality management systems (rural).</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs.</li> <li>3.3.1.3 Development Assessment.</li> <li>3.3.2 Strategy for implementing the Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.2.1 Recommended approach for implementing the WQIP in rural areas</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 241 242 249 251 252 253 255   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 236 236 237 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 249 251 252 253 255 260   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 236 237 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 242 249 251 252 253 255 260 261   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 236 237 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 241 242 242 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 280   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes.</li> <li>3.2.2 Learning for sustainability.</li> <li>3.2.1 Building leadership and organisational capacity for sustainability.</li> <li>3.3 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN RURAL AREAS.</li> <li>3.3.1 Existing water quality management systems (rural).</li> <li>3.3.1.1 Plans.</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs.</li> <li>3.3.2 Strategy for implementing the Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.2.2 Whole-farm planning.</li> <li>3.3.2.3 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.3.2.4 Improved land use planning in rural areas</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 236 237 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 242 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 280 283   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes.</li> <li>3.2.2 Learning for sustainability.</li> <li>3.2.2.1 Building leadership and organisational capacity for sustainability.</li> <li>3.3 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN RURAL AREAS.</li> <li>3.3.1 Existing water quality management systems (rural).</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs.</li> <li>3.3.1.3 Development Assessment.</li> <li>3.3.2 Strategy for implementing the Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.2.1 Recommended approach for implementing the WQIP in rural areas.</li> <li>3.3.2.3 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.3.2.4 Improved land use planning in rural areas.</li> <li>3.3.2.5 Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.3 Recommendations for management of unpaved roads.</li> <li>3.4.1 Summary of existing urban water quality management</li> </ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 236 236 237 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 280 283   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes.</li> <li>3.2.2.1 Building leadership and organisational capacity for sustainability.</li> <li>3.3 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN RURAL AREAS.</li> <li>3.3.1 Existing water quality management systems (rural).</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs.</li> <li>3.3.2 Strategy for implementing the Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.2.1 Recommended approach for implementing the WQIP in rural areas.</li> <li>3.3.2.3 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.3.2.4 Improved land use planning in rural areas.</li> <li>3.3.2.5 Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.7 Recommendations for management of unpaved roads.</li> <li>3.4.1 Summary of existing urban water quality management.</li> <li>3.4.1 Planning response</li> </ul>   | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 236 237 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 241 242 242 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 280 283 283 283   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 237 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 242 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 283 283 283 283 283   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes</li> <li>3.2.2 Learning for sustainability</li></ul>   | <b>233</b> 233 236 236 237 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 241 242 242 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 283 283 283 283 283 283   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes.</li> <li>3.2.2 Learning for sustainability.</li> <li>3.2.2.1 Building leadership and organisational capacity for sustainability.</li> <li>3.3 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN RURAL AREAS.</li> <li>3.3.1 Existing water quality management systems (rural).</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs.</li> <li>3.3.1.3 Development Assessment.</li> <li>3.3.2 Strategy for implementing the Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.2.1 Recommended approach for implementing the WQIP in rural areas.</li> <li>3.3.2.3 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.3.2.4 Improved land use planning in rural areas.</li> <li>3.3.2.5 Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.3 Recommendations for management of unpaved roads.</li> <li>3.4.1 Summary of existing urban water quality management.</li> <li>3.4.1.1 Planning response.</li> <li>3.4.1.3 Education and awareness.</li> <li>3.4.2 Future urban area management</li> </ul>   | <b>233</b> 233 236 236 237 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 242 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 283 283 283 283 283 284 285 286   |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes.</li> <li>3.2.2 Learning for sustainability.</li> <li>3.2.2 Learning for sustainability.</li> <li>3.2.1 Building leadership and organisational capacity for sustainability.</li> <li>3.3 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN RURAL AREAS.</li> <li>3.3.1 Existing water quality management systems (rural).</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs.</li> <li>3.3.1.3 Development Assessment.</li> <li>3.3.2 Strategy for implementing the Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.2.1 Recommended approach for implementing the WQIP in rural areas.</li> <li>3.3.2.3 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.3.2.4 Improved land use planning in rural areas.</li> <li>3.3.2.5 Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3 Recommendations for management of unpaved roads.</li> <li>3.4 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN URBAN AREAS.</li> <li>3.4.1 Summary of existing urban water quality management.</li> <li>3.4.1.2 Onground projects.</li> <li>3.4.1.3 Education and awareness.</li> <li>3.4.2 Future urban area management.</li> </ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 241 242 249 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 283 283 283 283 283 283 284 285 286 287                                     |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes.</li> <li>3.2.2 Learning for sustainability.</li> <li>3.2.2.1 Building leadership and organisational capacity for sustainability.</li> <li>3.3 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN RURAL AREAS.</li> <li>3.3.1 Existing water quality management systems (rural).</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs.</li> <li>3.3.1.3 Development Assessment.</li> <li>3.3.2 Strategy for implementing the Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.2.2 Whole-farm planning.</li> <li>3.3.2.3 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.3.2.4 Improved land use planning in rural areas.</li> <li>3.3.2.5 Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.3 Recommendations for management of unpaved roads.</li> <li>3.4.1 Summary of existing urban water quality management.</li> <li>3.4.1 Summary of existing urban water quality management.</li> <li>3.4.1.3 Education and awareness.</li> <li>3.4.2 Planning controls for development.</li> <li>3.4.2 Planning controls for development.</li> </ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 242 249 249 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 261 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 284 285 286 287 290                     |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes</li> <li>3.2.2.1 Building leadership and organisational capacity for sustainability.</li> <li>3.3 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN RURAL AREAS</li> <li>3.3.1 Existing water quality management systems (rural).</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs</li> <li>3.3.2.3 Extrategy for implementing the Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.2.1 Recommended approach for implementing the WQIP in rural areas</li> <li>3.3.2.2 Whole-farm planning.</li> <li>3.3.2.3 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.3.3 Recommendations for management of unpaved roads</li> <li>3.4 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN URBAN AREAS</li> <li>3.4.1 Summary of existing urban water quality management.</li> <li>3.4.1.3 Education and awareness.</li> <li>3.4.2 Future urban area management.</li> <li>3.4.2 Planning controls for development.</li> </ul>   | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 242 249 249 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 261 261 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 284 285 286 287 290 290 290 297 |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes</li> <li>3.2.2.1 Building leadership and organisational capacity for sustainability.</li> <li>3.3 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN RURAL AREAS</li> <li>3.3.1 Existing water quality management systems (rural).</li> <li>3.3.1.1 Plans.</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs.</li> <li>3.3.2.3 Development Assessment.</li> <li>3.3.2.4 Recommended approach for implementing the WQIP in rural areas</li> <li>3.3.2.5 Krategy for implementing the Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.2.4 Improved land use planning in rural areas</li> <li>3.3.2.5 Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3 Recommendations for management of unpaved roads</li> <li>3.4 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN URBAN AREAS</li> <li>3.4.1 Summary of existing urban water quality management.</li> <li>3.4.1.3 Education and awareness</li> <li>3.4.2 Future urban area management.</li> <li>3.4.2 Fluture urban area management.</li> <li>3.4.2 Planning controls for development.</li> <li>3.4.2 I Integrated water cycle management.</li> </ul> | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 249 249 249 251 252 253 255 260 260 261 261 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 284 285 285 286 287 290 297 209 |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 249 249 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 261 261 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283                             |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes</li></ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 236 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 242 249 249 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 261 261 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283                             |
| <ul> <li>PART 3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.</li> <li>3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PART 3.</li> <li>3.2 APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY.</li> <li>3.2.1 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.2.1.1 Responsible management of culturally significant landscapes.</li> <li>3.2.2 Learning for sustainability.</li> <li>3.2.1 Building leadership and organisational capacity for sustainability.</li> <li>3.3 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN RURAL AREAS.</li> <li>3.3.1.1 Plans.</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs.</li> <li>3.3.1.2 Programs.</li> <li>3.3.1.3 Development Assessment.</li> <li>3.3.2.2 Whole-farm planning.</li> <li>3.3.2.3 Partnerships.</li> <li>3.3.2.4 Improved land use planning in rural areas.</li> <li>3.3.2.5 Farm Scale Action Plan.</li> <li>3.3.7 Recommendations for management of unpaved roads.</li> <li>3.4 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN URBAN AREAS.</li> <li>3.4 CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT IN URBAN AREAS.</li> <li>3.4.1 Summary of existing urban water quality management.</li> <li>3.4.2 Onground projects.</li> <li>3.4.1.3 Education and awareness.</li> <li>3.4.2 Planning construction for development.</li> <li>3.4.2 Planning construction for development.</li> <li>3.4.2 Nurban construction for development.</li> <li>3.4.2 Planning construction sites</li> </ul>  | <b>233</b> 233 233 236 236 237 237 238 240 241 241 241 241 241 242 249 249 249 251 252 253 255 260 261 261 261 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283 283                     |

|   | 005                            |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 3.4.2.8 Managing established areas                            |                                |
| 3.4.2.9 Rainwater tanks retrotiting program                   |                                |
| 3.4.2.10 Other programs for established urban and dense rural | residential areas              |
| 3.4.2.11 Other opportunities                                  |                                |
| 3.4.2.12 Implementation strategy                              |                                |
| 3.5 Lake use strategies                                       |                                |
| 3.5.1 Existing lake use management systems                    |                                |
| 3.5.1.1 Boating activities                                    |                                |
| 3.5.1.2 Aquaculture industry                                  |                                |
| 3.5.2 Management recommendations for lake use                 |                                |
| 3.5.2.1 Boating impacts                                       |                                |
| 3.5.2.2 Oyster aquaculture                                    |                                |
| 3.6 INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT  |                                |
| 3.6.1 Implementation responsibilities                         |                                |
| 3.6.1.1 Great Lakes Council                                   |                                |
| 3 6 1 2 Greater Taree City Council                            | 340                            |
| 3 6 1 3 MidCoast Water  | 342                            |
| 3.6.1.4 Hunter-Central Rivers Catchment Management Authority  | v 343                          |
| 3.6.1.5 Department of Environment and Climate Change          | 31/1                           |
| 3.6.1.6 Department of Elanning                                |                                |
| 2.6.1.7 Department of Primary Industries (Agriculture)        |                                |
| 2.6.1.9 Other agencies' WOID actions                          |                                |
| 3.6.1.8 Other agencies WQIP actions                           |                                |
| 3.6.2 Coordination responsibilities                           |                                |
| 3.6.2.1 CCI Project Advisory Committee                        |                                |
| 3.6.2.2 Operational water cycle management agencies           |                                |
| 3.6.2.3 Joint Action Plan                                     |                                |
| 3.6.2.4 Aligning NRM and land use plans with the WQIP         |                                |
| 3.6.3 Way forward   |                                |
| 3.6.3.1 CCI Advisory Committee responsibilities               |                                |
| 3.6.3.2 NRM coordination forums' responsibilities             |                                |
| 3.6.3.3 Operational water cycle managers' responsibilities    |                                |
| 3.7 POLLUTION CONTROL SYSTEMS                                 |                                |
| 3.7.1 Policing development consents                           |                                |
| 3.7.1.1 Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979          |                                |
| 3.7.2 General pollution control                               |                                |
| 3.7.2.1 Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997     |                                |
| 3.7.3 Sewage discharge risks                                  |                                |
| 3.7.3.1 GLC On-site Sewage Management Strategy                |                                |
| 3.7.4 Erosion and sedimentation risks                         |                                |
| 3741 Introduction to legislation and policy                   | 376                            |
| 3 7 4 2 Management practice                                   | 379                            |
| 3 7 4 3 Recommendations                                       | 383                            |
| 3 7 5 Strategy for implementing recommendations               | Error! Bookmark not defined    |
| 3 7 5 1 Operational commitments                               | 384                            |
| 3 7 5 2 Contributions to community debate                     | 388                            |
| 3.7.6 Summany   | 200                            |
| 2.9 EINANGING THE WATER OHALITY IMPROVEMENT DUAN              |                                |
| 3.0 A DADTINE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY                             | ERROR: DUORMARK NUT DEFINED.   |
| 2.0.1 Embracing uncortainty                                   | Errori Bookmark not defined    |
| 2.0.2 Dlan / do / roviow loopo                                |                                |
| 3.9.2 Fian / 00 / review ioops                                | Errori Dookmark not dofined    |
| 5.9.2.1 Measuring performance                                 | . Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 3.9.2.2 Review and public reporting                           |                                |
| 3.9.2.3 Implementation strategy                               | . Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 3.9.2.4 Research agenda                                       |                                |

# LIST OF APPENDICES

#### [pt8]

| APPENDICES  |  | 433   |
|-------------|--|-------|
| APPENDIX 1  | ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY REPORT   | 441   |
| APPENDIX 2  | STATEMENTS OF JOINT INTENT   | 471   |
| APPENDIX 3  | EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL FLOW MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS                         |       |
| APPENDIX 4  | ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY THE COMMUNITY                                     | 493   |
| APPENDIX 5  | ESTIMATES OF MODEL RELIABILITY AND MODELLING LIMITATIONS               | 511   |
| APPENDIX 6  | CONTRIBUTIONS OF POLLUTANTS BY LAND USE IN INDIVIDUAL SUB-CATCHMENTS,  |       |
|             | Wallis Lake  | 535   |
| APPENDIX 7  | PRIORITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES                           |       |
| APPENDIX 8  | BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON WALLIS LAKE AND CATCHMENT                    | 601   |
| APPENDIX 9  | AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY PROFILES   | 631   |
| APPENDIX 10 | ESTABLISHING TARGETS FOR INDICATORS OF ECOLOGICAL CONDITION            | 637   |
| APPENDIX 11 | CASE STUDIES FROM THE GREAT LAKES COASTAL CATCHMENTS                   |       |
|             | INITIATIVE PROJECT   | 643   |
| APPENDIX 12 | SEASONAL VARIATION IN POLLUTANT LOADS FOR WALLIS AND MYALL LAKES       | 659   |
| APPENDIX 13 | ESTABLISHING THE FEASIBILITY OF THE WQIP SCENARIOS                     | 669   |
| APPENDIX 14 | WQIP SCENARIO DESCRIPTIONS FOR WALLIS LAKE                             | 671   |
| APPENDIX 15 | ECONOMIC VALUES (BENEFITS) OF WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS IN THE        |       |
|             | GREAT LAKES – DRAFT REPORT   | 703   |
| APPENDIX 16 | BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON SMITHS LAKE AND CATCHMENT                    | 747   |
| APPENDIX 17 | WQIP SCENARIO DESCRIPTIONS FOR SMITHS LAKE                             | 767   |
| APPENDIX 18 | BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON MYALL LAKES AND CATCHMENT                    | 783   |
| Appendix 19 | CONTRIBUTIONS OF POLLUTANTS BY LAND USE IN INDIVIDUAL SUB-CATCHMENTS,  |       |
|             | Myall Lakes  | 809   |
| APPENDIX 20 | WQIP SCENARIO DESCRIPTIONS FOR MYALL LAKES                             | 827   |
| APPENDIX 21 | DRINKING WATER STRATEGY FOR THE CRAWFORD RIVER                         | 849   |
| APPENDIX 22 | PRINCIPLES OF LEARNING FOR SUSTAINABILITY                              | 861   |
| APPENDIX 23 | BUILDING CONSUMMATE LEADERS FOR SUSTAINABILITY                         |       |
| APPENDIX 24 | LANDHOLDER COMMENTS AND PRACTITIONER NOTES REGARDING                   |       |
|             | FARM SCALE ACTION PLAN   | 869   |
| APPENDIX 25 | FARM-SCALE WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING TOOL                  |       |
| APPENDIX 26 | CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT PRACTITIONER NOTES FOR                            |       |
|             | ENGAGING WITH LANDHOLDERS  |       |
| APPENDIX 27 | DESIGN POINTS FOR ON-GROUND WORKS                                      |       |
|             | (RURAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES) (DRAFT)                                   | 903   |
| APPENDIX 28 | URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAM PLAN   | 941   |
| APPENDIX 29 | PLANS AND STRATEGIES IN THE GREAT LAKES REGION, AND THE AREAS IN WHICH | • • • |
|             | THEY SHOULD BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE WQIP                  |       |
| APPENDIX 30 | ECOLOGICAL MONITORING OF THE WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN            |       |
| BIBLIOGRAPH | (  | 973   |

## LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 1.3.1.   | The Great Lakes Coastal Catchments Initiative project area, showing the Myall Lakes, Smiths Lake and Wallis Lake catchments, and local government area boundaries                         | 2        |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| Figure 1.4.1.   | Stakeholders engaged in developing and reviewing the WQIP for Wallis and<br>Smiths lakes, and the Myall Lakes system  | <u>ح</u> |
| Figure 1.5.1.   | Components and process of the Great Lakes CCI project   | <br>5    |
| Figure 2.3.1.   | Conceptual diagram showing the difference between the natural water cycle<br>and a modified urban water cycle   |          |
| Figure 2.3.2.   | A conceptual diagram of generation of diffuse sources of pollutants and transport<br>into streams / rivers via surface and subsurface flows.  | 25       |
| Figure 2.3.3    | Zones in a coastal lake: Lake margin and central basin  | 28       |
| Figure 2.3.4.   | Distinct zones in a river estuary, defined by the interaction between fresh water<br>and salt water in the water profile: Tidal River, Upper Estuary, Middle Estuary<br>and Lower Estuary | 29       |
| Figure 2.3.5.   | Distinct zones in a river estuary of tidal river, upper estuary, middle estuary and lower estuary – as defined through estuary depth, width, turbidity, salinity                          |          |
|                 | and algae   | 30       |
| Figure 2.3.6.   | A conceptual diagram of nutrient cycling processes in coastal lakes and   | 24       |
| Figure 2.3.7    | Scientific modelling of catchment and estuary processes were used to  |          |
| 1 igure 2.3.7.  | construct the data base for the Great Lakes CCI Decision Support System (DSS) and, together with outputs from management planning and research projects, guided the DSS functions.        | 34       |
| Figure 2.4.1    | The seven primary sub-catchments of Wallis Lake Catchment   | 42       |
| Figure 2.4.2    | Modelled land use categories in the Wallis Lake Catchment   |          |
| Figure 2.5.1.   | Zones in the Wallis Lake estuary used for modelling and analysis.   |          |
| 5               | and reporting on condition in this Plan   | 49       |
| Figure 2.5.2.   | Mean chlorophyll-a concentrations ( $\mu$ g/L) recorded in Wallis Lake estuary by DECC Waters and Catchment Science in 2006/07  | 57       |
| Figure 2.5.3.   | Estuarine sponges and diverse benthic algae in Wallis Lake  |          |
| Figure 2.5.4.   | Biodiversity in Wallis Lake   | 60       |
| Figure 2.5.5.   | Current ecological condition of coastal lake water at south Wallis Lake and Coomba Bay  | 64       |
| Figure 2.5.6.   | Current ecological condition of the river estuaries in Wallis Lake  | 65       |
| Figure 2.5.7.   | An erosion gully feeding into Coomba Bay, Wallis Lake   | 66       |
| Figure 2.5.8.   | Coomba Bay, Wallis Lake, 7 June 2007 showing turbid (dirty) water,  |          |
|                 | mud area and absence of seagrass  | 67       |
| Figure 2.5.9.   | Forster sub-catchments draining into Wallis Lake  | 68       |
| Figure 2.5.10.  | Excessive growth of macroalgae over seagrass beds in Pipers Creek, Wallis Lake  | 69       |
| Figure 2.5.11.  | TN concentrations within the Lower Estuary and Wallis Lake for a large event (21 October 2004) and a dry period (26 November 2002)  | 73       |
| Figure 2.5.12.  | Wallis Lake and the complex of Islands that restrict mixing of the waters   | 75       |
| Figure 2.5.13   | Simulated TN concentrations in the Wallis Lake system for 7 10 13 15  | 75       |
| 1 igure 2.5.15. | and 18 May 2001   | 76       |
| Figure 2.5.14.  | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in the whole Wallis Lake catchment.   |          |
| Figure 2.6.1.   | Process for developing water quality targets for Wallis. Smiths and Mvall lakes   | 83       |
| Figure 2.7.1.   | Percentage change in Wallis Lake catchment exports of TN, TP and TSS both with (WQIP) and without (No Plan) implementation of the Water Quality   | 101      |
| Figure 2.7.2.   | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the whole Wallis Lake establisher with implementation of the WOIP  | 101      |
| Figure 2.7.3.   | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the  | 104      |
|                 | Wallamba River sub-catchment of the Wallis Lake system, with implementation of the WQIP   | 105      |
| Figure 2.7.4.   | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the  |          |
| J               | Wang Wauk River sub-catchment of the Wallis Lake system with implementation of the WQIP   | 106      |
| Figure 2.7.5.   | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the  |          |
| J:              | Coolongolook River sub-catchment of the Wallis Lake system with   |          |
|                 | implementation of the WQIP  | 107      |

| Figure 2.7.6.            | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the<br>Wallingat River sub-catchment of the Wallis Lake system with implementation<br>of the WQIP   | 8      |
|--------------------------|--|--------|
| Figure 2.7.7.            | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the Lower Estuary sub-catchment of the Wallis Lake system with implementation of the WQIP   | 9      |
| Figure 2.7.8.            | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the Wallis Lake (southern and western) sub-catchment of the Wallis Lake system with   |        |
| Figure 2.7.9.            | implementation of the WQIP   | C      |
| Figure 2.7.10            | of the WQIP  | 1      |
| 1 igure 2.7.10.          | Wallamba River in the Wallis Lake system   | 3      |
| Figure 2.7.11.           | Percentage change in chlorophyll-a achieved in the Lower Estuary of the Wallis Lake system   | з      |
| Figure 2.7.12.           | Percentage change in chlorophyll-a achieved in Pipers Bay of the   |        |
| Figure 2.7.13.           | Wallis Lake system   | 4      |
|                          | Wallamba, Coolongolook and Wang Wauk rivers in Wallis Lake   | 4      |
| Figure 2.7.14.           | Percentage change in chlorophyll-a achieved in Wallis Lake   | 5      |
| 1 igule 2.7.15.          | Wallis Lake catchment  | 6      |
| Figure 2.7.16.           | Cumulative costs of urban remediation actions in the Wallis Lake catchment   | 7      |
| Figure 2.8.1.            | Smiths Lake catchment  | 2      |
| Figure 2.8.2.            | Modelled land uses in the Smiths Lake catchment  | 3      |
| Figure 2.9.1.            | Current ecological condition of the coastal lake water body of Smiths Lake   | 9<br>1 |
| Figure 2.9.2.            | Response of Similins Lake to an entrance opening   | I      |
| Figure 2.9.3.            | (TSS) in the Smithe Lake estebation (TSS) in the Smithe (TSS) in the Smithe Lake estebation (TSS) in the Smithe (TSS) in t | 1      |
| Figure 2 10 1            | Process for developing water quality targets for Wallis, Smiths and Mual Jakes 14  | +<br>5 |
| Figure 2.10.1.           | Percentage change in Smiths Lake catchment evolution of TN_TP and TSS  | J      |
| 1 igure 2.11.1.          | both with (WOIP) and without (No Plan) implementation of the Water Ouality   |        |
|                          | Improvement Plan   | 7      |
| Figure 2.11.2.           | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the Smiths Lake catchment with implementation of the WQIP   | 8      |
| Figure 2.11.3.           | Percentage change in chlorophyll-a concentrations in Smiths Lake,  |        |
|                          | both with (WQIP) and without (No Plan) implementation of the Water Quality   | ~      |
| Figure 2 11 4            | Cumulative costs of Plan actions in Smiths Lake  | 9      |
| Figure 2.11.4.           | The Myall Lakes sub establights and major tributorios  | ך<br>כ |
| Figure 2.12.1.           | Modelled land use estagories in the Myall Lakes estebaent  | 2      |
| Figure 2.12.2.           | Zones in Myall Lakes system used for modelling and analysis  | J      |
| 1 igure 2. 15. 1.        | and reporting on condition in this Plan 17   | 6      |
| Figure 2 13 2            | Mean chlorophyll-a concentrations (ug/L) calculated from DNR data  |        |
| 1 19010 2.10.2.          | (1999 to 2002), NPWS / DNR Data (2003 to 2005) and DECC  |        |
|                          | Waters and Catchment Science data (2006/07)  | 3      |
| Figure 2.13.3.           | Current ecological condition of the Myall Lakes water bodies of Myall Lake,  | _      |
| <b>-</b> ; <b>0</b> 40 4 | Boolambayte Lake and Bombah Broadwater   | 8      |
| Figure 2.13.4.           | Current ecological condition of the Upper Myall River estuary  | J      |
| Figure 2.13.5.           | Relative contributions of land use activities to pollutants (IN, IP) and sediments   | ~      |
|                          | (155) In the Myali Lakes catchment   | 2      |
| Figure 2.14.1.           | Process for developing water quality targets for walls, Smiths and Myali lakes   | С      |
| Figure 2.15.1.           | Myall Lakes under the No Plan and WOIP alternative futures 210   | 0      |
| Figure 2 15 2            | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the whole   | J      |
| 1 igure 2. 10.2.         | Mvall Lakes catchment with implementation of the WOIP 214  | 4      |
| Figure 2 15 3            | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the   | т      |
| 1 iguro 2. roto.         | Myall Lake sub-catchment with implementation of the WQIP   | 5      |
| Figure 2.15.4.           | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the   |        |
| -                        | Boolambayte Lake sub-catchment with implementation of the WQIP216  | 6      |
| Figure 2.15.5.           | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the   |        |
|                          | Upper Myall River sub-catchment with implementation of the WQIP21  | 7      |
| Figure 2.15.6.           | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the   | ~      |
|                          | Crawford River sub-catchment with implementation of the WQIP   | 3      |
| ⊢igure 2.15.7.           | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for the Bombah  | 0      |
|                          |  | J      |

| Figure 2.15.8.       | Relative modelled impact of expanded remediation actions for<br>Lower Myall River sub-catchment with implementation of the WQIP | 220 |
|----------------------|---|-----|
| Figure 2.15.9.       | Percentage change in chlorophyll-a achieved in the Myall Lakes under the  | 221 |
| Eiguro 2 15 10       | Cumulative costs of potential rural WOIP actions  | 221 |
| Figure 3.4.1         | Comparison of loads from various land use scenarios   | 288 |
| Figure 3.4.2         | Single dwelling to two lots – Unmitigated and 'Deemed to Comply' solution   | 200 |
| Figure 3.4.2.        | Proposed release areas in the Forster region  | 303 |
| Figure 3.4.0.        | Proposed WSLID retrofitting locations   | 304 |
| Figure 3.4.5         | Dense urban area street tree bioretention   | 306 |
| Figure 3.4.6         | Street tree bioretention 'nods'   | 307 |
| Figure 3.4.7         | Diagram of pod retrofitting into existing kerb  |     |
| Figure 3.4.8         | A retrofitting proposal for Pipers Creek catchment  |     |
| Figure 3 4 9         | Smiths Lake sub-catchments and release areas  |     |
| Figure 3.7.1         | Frosion and sedimentation control efficiency  |     |
| Figure 3.9.1.        | Adaptive management activities  | 412 |
| Figure 3.9.2         | Fundamental plan / do / review loops in the WQIP  | 414 |
| Figure 3.9.3.        | The new Local Government Planning Framework   |     |
| Figure A1.1.         | Landholders filling in surveys at workshops   |     |
| Figure A1.2.         | Landholders attending research and feedback workshop at Bunvah  | 453 |
| Figure A1.3.         | Advisory Committee attending field visit and meeting  | 455 |
| Figure A1.4.         | Great Lakes Council, Greater Taree City Council, Catchment Management   |     |
| 0                    | Authority and MidCoast Water signing Statements of Joint Intent   | 460 |
| Figure A3.1.         | Example flow duration curve for an unregulated river  | 489 |
| Figure A5.1.         | Calibration points within the Myall Lakes and Wallis Lake catchments  | 517 |
| Figure A5.2.         | Observed vs modelled estimates of runoff from the Bombah Broadwater,  |     |
| -                    | Coolongolook, Wallamba and Wang Wauk  | 520 |
| Figure A6.1.         | Location of sub-catchments of Wallis Lake   | 535 |
| Figure A6.2.         | The Wallamba River sub-catchments   | 540 |
| Figure A6.3.         | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in the  |     |
|                      | Wallamba River sub-catchments   | 543 |
| Figure A6.4.         | The Wang Wauk River sub-catchments  | 545 |
| Figure A6.5.         | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in the  |     |
|                      | Wang Wauk River sub-catchments  | 547 |
| Figure A6.6.         | The Coolongolook River sub-catchments   | 549 |
| Figure A6.7.         | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in the  |     |
|                      | Coolongolook River sub-catchments   | 551 |
| Figure A6.8.         | The Wallingat River sub-catchments  | 553 |
| Figure A6.9.         | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in the  | 4   |
| <b>E</b> inung AC 40 | Wallingat River sub-catchments  | 554 |
| Figure A6.10.        | Deletive contribution of land use activities to nellutante and area in the  | 550 |
| Figure Ab. I I       | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutarits and area in the   | EEO |
| Figure AG 10         | Lower River Estuary sub-calcriments   | 000 |
| Figure A6.12.        | Pelative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in the  | 500 |
| rigule A0.15.        | southern and western sub-catchments of Wallis Lake  | 562 |
| Figure A6 14         | The Wallis Lake_Forster sub-catchments  | 564 |
| Figure A6 15         | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in the  | 004 |
| rigure / to. ro.     | Forster sub-catchments of Wallis Lake   | 566 |
| Figure A6 16         | Pollutants and areas by land use. Upper Wallamba River (HS1a)   | 567 |
| Figure A6.17.        | Pollutants and areas by land use. Firefly River (HS1b)  |     |
| Figure A6.18.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Khoribakh Creek (HS1c)  | 569 |
| Figure A6.19.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Candoormakh and Pipeclay Creeks (HS1d)  | 570 |
| Figure A6.20.        | Pollutants and areas by land use. Bungwahl and Darawakh Creeks (HS2)  | 571 |
| Figure A6.21.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Minimbah and Tuncurry (HS3)   | 572 |
| Figure A6.22.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Wallingat River (HS4)   | 573 |
| Figure A6.23.        | Pollutants and areas by land use. Coomba Creek (HS5)  | 574 |
| Figure A6.24.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Duck Creek (HS6)  | 575 |
| Figure A6.25.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Bunyah Creek (HS7a)   | 576 |
| Figure A6.26.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Upper Wang Wauk River (HS7b)  | 577 |
| Figure A6.27.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Lower Wang Wauk River (HS7c)  | 578 |
| Figure A6.28.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Coolongolook Estuary Reach (HS8)  | 579 |
| Figure A6.29.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Cureeki Creek (HS9a)  | 580 |
| Figure A6.30.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Upper Coolongolook River (HS9b)   | 581 |
| Figure A6.31.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Lower Coolongolook River (HS9c)   | 582 |
| Figure A6.32.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Beaky Bay (HS10)  | 583 |
| Figure A6.33.        | Pollutants and areas by land use, Coomba / Wallis Island (HS11)   | 584 |

| Figure A6.34.  | Pollutants and areas by land use, Coomba Bay (HS12)  | . 585  |
|--|--|--|
| Figure A6.35   | Pollutants and areas by land use. Whoota / Yarric (HS13)   | 586  |
| Figure A6.36   | Pollutants and areas by land use, Pacific Palms (HS14)   | 587  |
| Figure A6 37   | Pollutants and areas by land use. Booti Booti (HS15)   | 588  |
| Figure A6 38   | Pollutants and areas by land use, Green Point (HS16)   | 580  |
| Figure A6.30   | Pollutants and areas by land use, Dipers Pay (Cope Howks) (HS17)   | . 509  |
| Figure A0.39.  | Pollutants and areas by land use, Pipers Bay (Cape Hawke) (HS17)   | . 590  |
| Figure A6.40.  | Pollutants and areas by land use, Pipers Creek (South Forster) (HS18)  | . 591  |
| Figure A6.41.  | Pollutants and areas by land use, Big Island (HS19)  | . 592  |
| Figure A6.42.  | Pollutants and areas by land use, Forster (HS20)   | . 593  |
| Figure A8.1.   | Location of Wallis Lake within the Great Lakes in the Hunter-Central Rivers  |  |
|  | region, just north of the Myall Lakes and Smiths Lake catchments   | .603   |
| Figure A8.2.   | Local government jurisdictions within the Wallis Lake catchment  | . 604  |
| Figure A8.3.   | Land uses in the Wallis Lake catchment   | . 609  |
| Figure A8.4.   | Aerial image of the Wallis Lake entrance, showing the major urban settlements  |  |
| <b>U</b>   | of Forster and Tuncurry  | .613   |
| Figure A8.5.   | Macrophyte vegetation in Wallis Lake catchment   | .615   |
| Figure A10 1   | Range of data from a high conservation value system and a disturbed system   | 639  |
| Figure A11 1   | Diagram showing how the maximum denth that seagrass can survive  |  |
| rigare / tritte  | at is directly related to the water clarity  | 644  |
| Figure A11.2   | Eate of pollution from Wallamba Piver  | 645  |
| Figure A11.2.  | Fate of pollution from Wang Wayk Diver   | 646  |
| Figure A11.5.  |  | .040   |
| Figure A11.4.  | Map of Wallis Lake   | .647   |
| Figure A11.5(a).   | Coomba Bay / June 2007, showing turbid (dirty) water, mud area and   |  |
|  | absence of seagrass  | . 649  |
| Figure A11.5(b).   | Google Earth image of Coomba Bay showing turbid (dirty) water and  |  |
|  | absence of seagrass  | . 649  |
| Figure A11.6(a).   | Coomba Bay erosion gully   | . 651  |
| Figure A11.6(b).   | Location of Coomba Bay erosion gully remediation works   | .651   |
| Figure A11.7.  | Land-based muds have smothered seagrass over an area of at least 2.5 ha  |  |
| 0  | along the shore of Coomba Bay  | .652   |
| Figure A11.8   | Excessive growth of macroalgae over seagrass beds in Pipers Creek  | 653  |
| Figure A11.9   | Healthy clear-water ecosystems around Farns Island showing   |  |
| rigulo / (11.0.  | rare estuarine sponges and diverse benthic algae   | 655  |
| Figure A12 1   | Average monthly temperature and precipitation in the Great Lakes region  | 660  |
| Figure A12.1.  | Mean runoff volume and TN_TD and TSS leads for the Wallamba Diver  | . 000  |
| rigule A12.2.  | alibrated aub astabaent  | 661  |
|  | Calibrated Sub-Calchinent.   | . 00 1   |
| Figure A12.3.  | Weah ruhon volume and TN, TP and TSS loads for the wang walk River   | 000  |
| -  | calibrated sub-catchment.  | .662   |
| Figure A12.4.  | Mean runoff volume and TN, TP and TSS loads for the Coolongolook River   |  |
|  | calibrated sub-catchment   | .663   |
| Figure A12.5.  | Mean runoff volume and TN, TP and TSS loads for the Smiths Lake  |  |
|  | calibrated sub-catchment   | . 665  |
| Figure A12.6.  | Mean runoff volume and TN, TP and TSS loads for the Bulahdelah   |  |
|  | calibrated sub-catchment   | 667  |
| Figure A14.1.  |  | .007   |
|  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover   | .681   |
| FIGURE A14.2.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS   | .681   |
| Figure A14.2.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes  | .681<br>691  |
| Figure A14.2.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes  | .681<br>.691<br>.707   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.   | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes<br>Total Economic Value  | .681<br>.691<br>.707   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes<br>Total Economic Value<br>Measurement of Economic Values over Time With and<br>Without a Policy Outcome   | .681<br>.691<br>.707   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes<br>Total Economic Value<br>Measurement of Economic Values over Time With and<br>Without a Policy Outcome   | .691<br>.707<br>.710   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.   | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes<br>Total Economic Value<br>Measurement of Economic Values over Time With and<br>Without a Policy Outcome<br>Catchment Exports for Wallis Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Wallis Lake With and Without the WQIP   | .681<br>.691<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes<br>Total Economic Value<br>Measurement of Economic Values over Time With and<br>Without a Policy Outcome<br>Catchment Exports for Wallis Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Smiths Lake With and Without the WQIP   | .607<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.   | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes<br>Total Economic Value<br>Measurement of Economic Values over Time With and<br>Without a Policy Outcome<br>Catchment Exports for Wallis Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Smiths Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the WQIP   | .681<br>.691<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A15.6.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes<br>Total Economic Value<br>Measurement of Economic Values over Time With and<br>Without a Policy Outcome<br>Catchment Exports for Wallis Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Smiths Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the Drinking Water Strategy  | .681<br>.691<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A15.6.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes<br>Total Economic Value<br>Measurement of Economic Values over Time With and<br>Without a Policy Outcome<br>Catchment Exports for Wallis Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Smiths Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the Drinking Water Strategy<br>for the Crawford Catchment.   | .607<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A15.6.<br>Figure A16.1.   | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes<br>Total Economic Value<br>Measurement of Economic Values over Time With and<br>Without a Policy Outcome<br>Catchment Exports for Wallis Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Smiths Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the Drinking Water Strategy<br>for the Crawford Catchment<br>Location of Smiths Lake and its catchment relative to Wallis Lake and Myall Lake.   | .607<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A15.6.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.2.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes<br>Total Economic Value<br>Measurement of Economic Values over Time With and<br>Without a Policy Outcome<br>Catchment Exports for Wallis Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Smiths Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the Drinking Water Strategy<br>for the Crawford Catchment<br>Location of Smiths Lake and its catchment relative to Wallis Lake and Myall Lake.<br>Distribution and extent of land use activities within the Smiths Lake catchment  | .607<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749<br>.754   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A15.6.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.2.<br>Figure A16.3.   | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcoverSub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS sub-catchment codes   | .607<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749<br>.754<br>.757   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A15.6.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.2.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.4.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes<br>Total Economic Value<br>Measurement of Economic Values over Time With and<br>Without a Policy Outcome<br>Catchment Exports for Wallis Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Smiths Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the WQIP<br>Catchment Exports for Myall Lake With and Without the Drinking Water Strategy<br>for the Crawford Catchment<br>Location of Smiths Lake and its catchment relative to Wallis Lake and Myall Lake.<br>Distribution and extent of land use activities within the Smiths Lake catchment<br>Smiths Lake is contained within the Port Stephens–Great Lakes Marine Park<br>Seagrass habitat within Smiths Lake. | .607<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749<br>.754<br>.757<br>.758   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A15.6.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.2.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A17.1.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcoverSub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS sub-catchment codes   | .681<br>.691<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749<br>.754<br>.757<br>.758<br>.771   |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A15.6.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.2.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A17.1.<br>Figure A18.1.   | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes  | .687<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749<br>.754<br>.757<br>.758<br>.771<br>.785                                 |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A15.6.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.2.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A18.1.<br>Figure A18.2.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes  | .607<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749<br>.754<br>.757<br>.758<br>.771<br>.785<br>.789                         |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A15.6.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.2.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Fi | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes  | .687<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749<br>.754<br>.757<br>.758<br>.771<br>.785<br>.789                         |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A15.6.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.2.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A18.1.<br>Figure A18.2.<br>Figure A18.3.   | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes  | .607<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749<br>.754<br>.757<br>.758<br>.771<br>.785<br>.789<br>.793                 |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.2.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A18.1.<br>Figure A18.2.<br>Figure A18.3.<br>Figure A19.1   | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes  | .607<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749<br>.757<br>.758<br>.771<br>.785<br>.789<br>.793<br>.813                 |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.2.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A18.1.<br>Figure A18.2.<br>Figure A18.3.<br>Figure A19.1.<br>Figure A19.1.<br>Figure A19.2  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover<br>Sub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS<br>sub-catchment codes  | .607<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749<br>.735<br>.749<br>.757<br>.758<br>.771<br>.785<br>.789<br>.793<br>.813 |
| Figure A14.2.<br>Figure A15.1.<br>Figure A15.2.<br>Figure A15.3.<br>Figure A15.4.<br>Figure A15.5.<br>Figure A16.1.<br>Figure A16.2.<br>Figure A16.3.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A16.4.<br>Figure A18.1.<br>Figure A18.2.<br>Figure A18.3.<br>Figure A19.1.<br>Figure A19.2.  | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcoverSub-catchments of the Wallis and Smiths lakes, showing DSS sub-catchment codes   | .607<br>.681<br>.707<br>.710<br>.722<br>.729<br>.734<br>.735<br>.749<br>.757<br>.758<br>.771<br>.785<br>.789<br>.793<br>.813                 |

| Figure A19.3.                 | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in<br>Boolambayte Creek sub-catchment                         | .817 |
|-------------------------------|---|------|
| Figure A19.4.                 | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in  | 819  |
| Figure A19.5.                 | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in<br>Crawford River sub-catchment                            | .821 |
| Figure A19.6.                 | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in<br>Bombah Broadwater sub-catchment                         | .823 |
| Figure A19.7.                 | Relative contribution of land use activities to pollutants and area in<br>I ower Myall River sub-catchment                        | 825  |
| Figure A20.1.<br>Figure A21.1 | Interpolated effect of management programs for groundcover  | .837 |
|                               | TSS with (WQIP) implementation of the Water Quality Improvement Plan  | 851  |
| Figure A21.2.                 | Crawford River – Relative impact of component remediation actions for the whole catchment   | .851 |
| Figure A21.3.                 | Percentage change in chlorophyll-a achieved in the Myall Lakes due to the<br>potential Crawford River Drinking Water plan actions | 852  |
| Figure A21.4.                 | Cumulative costs of potential Crawford WQIP actions   | 853  |

# LIST OF TABLES

| Table 0.1.     | Stakeholder engagement in WQIP development  | viii  |
|----------------|---|-------|
| Table 0.2.     | Remediation actions proposed in the Water Quality Improvement Plan.                 | xiii  |
| Table 0.3.     | Protection actions proposed in the Water Quality Improvement Plan                   | xiv   |
| Table 0.4.     | Summary of costs associated with implementing the                                   |       |
| Table 1 5 1    | Water Quality Improvement Plan after seven years.                                   | .XVII |
| Table 1.5.1.   | Key steps for establishing ecological condition targets and WQIP actions for the    | 15    |
| Table 2.3.1    | Forms of nitrogon and phosphorus that can be found in coastal lakes                 | 15    |
|                | and river estuany waters, and their likely short term bioavailability to stimulate  |       |
|                | and fiver estuary waters, and their likely short-term bloavailability to sumulate   | 30    |
| Table 2.3.2    | Land use classes used in the rural land use model AnnACNIPS                         | 52    |
|                | and as represented in combined classes in the Great Lakes CCL DSS                   | 35    |
| Table 2.3.3    | Modelled hydrodynamic features of the Wallis Smiths and Myall lakes                 | 36    |
| Table 2.5.0.   | Pollutant removal by Kularoo Drive Wetlands urban catchment management              |       |
|                | in the Wallis Lake catchment  | 53    |
| Table 2.5.2    | Impact of Wallis Lake sub-catchment group pollutant exports on                      |       |
| 10010 2.0.2.   | ecological condition in the Wallis Lake estuary zones                               | 61    |
| Table 2.5.3    | Average chloronhvll-a concentrations (µg/L) recorded in                             |       |
| 14610 2.0.0.   | Southern Wallis Lake and Coomba Bay   | 67    |
| Table 2.5.4    | Average chlorophyll-a concentrations (µg/L) recorded in                             |       |
| 14610 2.0.1.   | Pipers Creek and Pipers Bay, Wallis Lake  |       |
| Table 2.5.5.   | Average chlorophyll-a concentrations (ug/L) recorded in                             |       |
|                | the lower estuary water bodies of Wallis Lake                                       | 70    |
| Table 2.5.6.   | Average chlorophyll-a concentrations (ug/L) recorded in                             |       |
|                | the middle estuaries of Wallis Lake   | 71    |
| Table 2.5.7.   | Average chlorophyll-a concentrations (µg/L) recorded in                             |       |
|                | the upper estuaries of the Wallis Lake system                                       | 72    |
| Table 2.5.8.   | Area and pollutant exports from Wallis Lake sub-catchment groups                    | 79    |
| Table 2.6.2.   | Environmental values and uses given by stakeholders and the community               |       |
|                | for Wallis Lake Estuary   | 84    |
| Table 2.6.1.   | Ecological condition targets using chlorophyll-a concentrations, and estimates of   |       |
|                | feasible change for Wallis Lake estuary zones                                       | 92    |
| Table 2.6.2.   | Feasible catchment load reductions in Wallis Lake that achieve predicted change     |       |
|                | in chlorophyll-a concentrations   | 93    |
| Table 2.7.1.   | Remediation actions modelled for rural areas of the Wallis Lake Catchment           | 96    |
| Table 2.7.2.   | Remediation actions modelled for urban areas in the Wallis Lake catchment           | 97    |
| Table 2.7.3.   | Protection actions considered for the Wallis Lake catchment                         | 97    |
| Table 2.7.4.   | Scenario trajectories with (WQIP) and without (No Plan) the implementation          |       |
|                | of the Water Quality Improvement Plan for the Wallis Lake catchment                 | 100   |
| Table 2.7.5.   | Percentage change in loads from the modelled Wallis Lake sub-catchment              |       |
|                | groups achieved after seven years implementation of the WQIP                        | 102   |
| Table 2.7.6.   | Cost (\$) per unit of load controlled by modelled rural remediation actions applied |       |
|                | across the Wallis Lake catchment  | 116   |
| l able 2.7.7.  | Cost (\$) per unit of load controlled by urban actions applied across the           |       |
|                | Wallis Lake catchment.  | 118   |
| Table 2.7.8.   | Summary of recommended programs in the Wallis Lake catchment: Protection,           | 440   |
| Table 0.7.0    | remediation and management support  | 119   |
| Table 2.7.9.   | Summary of total costs at seven years of remediation, protection and managemen      | 101   |
| Table 0.7.40   | Support actions in the Wallis Lake catchment as recommended by the Plan             | 124   |
| Table 2.7.10.  | Vollis Lake WOID benefit east ratio of individual actions                           | 120   |
| Table 2.7.11.  | Wallis Lake WQIF Delient-cost ratio of individual actions                           | 120   |
| 1 able 2.9.1.  | Smithe Lake   | 140   |
| Table 2.0.2    | Area (ba) and nitrogen (kg) phosphorus (kg) and codiment (toppes) leads for         | 140   |
| 1 4016 2.9.2.  | Smiths Lake sub-catchments  | 1/2   |
| Table 2 10 1   | Environmental values and uses given by stakeholders and the community for           | 142   |
| 10010 2.10.1.  | Smiths Lake   | 146   |
| Table 2 10 2   | Ecological Condition Target for Smiths Lake and the feasible reduction in           | 1-10  |
| 1 3010 2.10.2. | chlorophyll-a concentrations  | 150   |
| Table 2.10.3.  | Feasible catchment load reductions in Smiths Lake that achieve predicted            |       |
|                | change in chlorophyll-a concentrations  | 150   |
| Table 2.11.1.  | Remediation actions modelled for rural areas of the Smiths Lake catchment.          | 153   |
| Table 2.11.2.  | Remediation actions modelled for urban areas in the Smiths Lake catchment           | 154   |
|                |   |       |

| Table 2 11 3    | Protection actions considered for the Smiths Lake catchment                         | 154   |
|-----------------|---|-------|
| Table 2.11.4.   | Scenario trajectories with (WQIP) and without (No Plan) the implementation          |       |
|                 | of the Water Quality Improvement Plan for the Smiths Lake catchment                 | . 156 |
| Table 2.11.5.   | Cost (\$) per unit of load controlled by modelled remediation actions               |       |
|                 | applied across the Smiths Lake catchment  | . 160 |
| Table 2.11.6.   | Summary of recommended programs in the Smiths Lake catchment:                       |       |
|                 | Protection, remediation and management support                                      | . 162 |
| Table 2.11.7.   | Summary of total costs at seven years of remediation, protection and management     | nt    |
|                 | support actions for Smiths Lake catchment as recommended by the Plan                | . 166 |
| Table 2.11.8.   | Costs and benefits for the Smiths Lake management actions                           | 167   |
| Table 2.11.9.   | Smiths Lake WQIP benefit-cost ratio of individual actions                           | 168   |
| Table 2.13.1.   | Average chlorophyll-a concentrations (µg/L) recorded in the Myall Lakes             | . 187 |
| Table 2.13.2.   | Area and pollutant exports from the Myall Lakes sub-catchments                      |       |
|                 | (estimated using the DSS)   | 191   |
| Table 2.14.1.   | Environmental values and uses given by stakeholders and community                   | 400   |
| Table 0.44.0    | Tor Myall Lakes   | . 196 |
| Table 2. 14.2.  | Ecological Condition Targets and predicted reduction in chlorophyli-a               | 202   |
| Table 2 14 3    | Prodicted catchmont load reductions for the Myall Lakes system following            | 202   |
| Table 2. 14.3.  | implementation of the WOIP  | 203   |
| Table 2 15 1    | Remediation actions modelled for rural areas of the Myall Lakes catchment           | 205   |
| Table 2.15.1.   | Protection actions considered for the Myall Lakes catchment                         | 205   |
| Table 2 15 3    | Scenario trajectories with (WOIP) and without (No Plan) the implementation          | 201   |
| 14610 2.10.0.   | of the Water Quality Improvement Plan   | 209   |
| Table 2,15,4    | Percentage change in loads from the modelled sub-catchments and the whole           |       |
|                 | Myall Lakes catchment achieved after seven years implementation of the WOIP.        | 211   |
| Table 2.15.5.   | Cost (\$) per unit of load controlled by modelled rural remediation actions applied |       |
|                 | across the Mvall Lakes catchment  | 223   |
| Table 2.15.6.   | Summary of recommended programs in the Mvall Lakes: Protection.                     |       |
|                 | remediation and management support  | 224   |
| Table 2.15.7.   | Summary of total costs of protection, remediation and management                    |       |
|                 | support options recommended for the Myall Lakes at seven years                      | . 228 |
| Table 2.15.8.   | Costs and benefits for the Myall Lakes management actions                           | . 229 |
| Table 2.15.9.   | Myall Lakes WQIP benefit-cost ratio of individual actions                           | . 230 |
| Table 3.1.1.    | Great Lakes Council's commitment to the levels of engagement in this strategy       | . 235 |
| Table 3.3.1.    | Summary of Current rural programs that deliver water quality outcomes               | . 244 |
| Table 3.3.2.    | Farm Scale Action Plan  | . 261 |
| Table 3.3.3.    | Action plan for rural road management   | . 281 |
| Table 3.4.1.    | Quantitative definitions of catchment water quality targets                         | . 288 |
| Table 3.4.2.    | Targets for urban and dense rural residential land development                      | . 289 |
| Table 3.4.3.    | Proposed Development Control Plan provisions  | . 296 |
| Table 3.4.4.    | Redevelopment scenario results – percentage change from existing case               | . 298 |
| Table 3.4.5.    | Example Integrated Water Cycle Management Objectives                                | 299   |
| l able 3.4.6.   | Improvements in pollutant loads to Pipers Creek and Pipers Bay that can be          |       |
|                 | achieved with a substantial drainage system retrolitting program                    | 308   |
| Table 3.4.7.    | Improvements in poliutant loads to Smiths Lake that can be achieved with a          | 200   |
| Table 2.4.9     | Substantial drainage system retrointing program                                     | 309   |
| Table 3.4.0.    | for urban stakeholders  | 212   |
| Table 3.4.9     | Implementation strategy for urban and dense rural residential areas                 | 321   |
| Table 3.5.1     | Implementation strategy of urban and dense fundities denial areas                   |       |
|                 | impacts of lake uses  | 332   |
| Table 3.6.1     | Draft Joint Action Plan for the Great Lakes WQIP                                    | 353   |
| Table 3.6.2     | Integration of the Water Quality Improvement Plan and MidCoast Water's              |       |
|                 | Sustainable Water Cycle Management Strategy   | 358   |
| Table 3.6.3.    | SoJI partners' plans that need to be reviewed for alignment with the WQIP           |       |
| Table 3.7.1.    | Recommendations to improve pollution control systems                                | . 384 |
| Table 3.7.2.    | Contributions to community debate about pollution control                           | . 388 |
| Table 3.8.1.    | Possible sources of funds for the WQIP  | . 394 |
| Table 3.8.2.    | Options for resourcing programs   | . 399 |
| Table 3.9.1.    | Working with key uncertainties  | . 404 |
| Table 3.9.2(a). | Operational and output measures by program  | 415   |
| Table 3.9.2(b). | Ecological and outcome measures by program  | 418   |
| Table 3.9.3.    | Implementation strategy for the adaptive management program                         | . 429 |
| Table A1.1.     | Great Lakes Council's commitment to the levels of engagement in this strategy       | . 443 |
| Table A1.2.     | Engagement opportunities in the CCI Project   | 448   |

| Table A1.3.       | Evaluation techniques for engagement strategy objectives and                           |     |
|-------------------|--|-----|
|                   | associated measures of success   | 462 |
| Table A4.1.       | Wallis Lake issues   | 494 |
| Table A4.2.       | Smiths Lake issues   | 501 |
| Table A4.3.       | Myali Lakes issues   | 504 |
| Table A5.1.       | Wodel development for the Great Lakes CCI project                                      | 511 |
| Table A5.2.       | Summary of data used to develop and test the AppACNDS models for the                   | 513 |
| TADIE A5.5.       | Great Lakes catchments   | 514 |
| Table A5 4        | A comparison of observed (O) and modelled (M) estimates of total event runoff          |     |
| 10010710.1.       | volume, total nitrogen (TN), total phosphorus (TP) and total suspended solids          |     |
|                   | (TSS) between July and December 2006.  | 519 |
| Table A5.5.       | Precision of model predictions given by the coefficients of efficiency                 |     |
|                   | proposed by Nash and Futcliffe (1970)  | 521 |
| Table A5.6.       | A comparison of annual nutrient and sediment exports generated by                      |     |
|                   | AnnAGNPS and an Australian-based model (E2)  | 522 |
| Table A5.7.       | Summary of lake estuary models   | 525 |
| Table A5.8.       | Defining ecological response in the Great Lakes  | 527 |
| Table A5.9.       | Sources of uncertainty in the outputs from the DSS, and the catchment export           | 500 |
|                   | and estuary models   | 530 |
| Table A5.10.      | Representing scales and processes in the Great Lakes CCI modelling                     | 533 |
| Table A6.1.       | Sub-calcriments of Wallis Lake   | 530 |
|                   | Area and pollutant exports from the Wallamba Diver sub-catchments                      | 542 |
| Table A6.4        | Percentage area of target and non-target land in the Wallamba River                    |     |
|                   | sub-catchments, and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands                 | 542 |
| Table A6.5.       | Area and pollutant exports from the Wang Wauk River sub-catchments                     |     |
| Table A6.6.       | Percentage area of target and non-target land in the Wang Wauk River                   |     |
|                   | sub-catchments, and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands                 | 548 |
| Table A6.7.       | Area and pollutant exports from the Coolongolook River sub-catchments                  | 550 |
| Table A6.8.       | Percentage area of target and non-target land in the Coolongolook River                |     |
|                   | sub-catchments, and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands                 | 550 |
| Table A6.9.       | Percentage area of target and non-target land in the Wallingat River                   |     |
|                   | sub-catchments, and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands                 | 552 |
| Table A6.10.      | Area and pollutant exports from the Lower River Estuary sub-catchments                 | 557 |
| Table A6.11.      | Percentage area of target and non-target land in the Lower Estuary                     |     |
| <b>T</b> 11 AQ 40 | sub-catchments, and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands                 | 557 |
| Table A6.12.      | Area and pollutant exports from the southern and western sub-catchments                | 504 |
| Table AG 12       | Of Wallis Lake   | 561 |
| Table A0.15.      | sub-catchments of Wallis Lake, and the amount of total loads sourced                   |     |
|                   | from these lands   | 561 |
| Table A6 14       | Area and pollutant exports from the Forster sub-catchments of Wallis Lake              | 565 |
| Table A6.15.      | Percentage area of target and non-target land in the Forster sub-catchments            |     |
|                   | of Wallis Lake, and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands                 | 565 |
| Table A7.1.       | Key areas of future research and development for non-urban                             |     |
|                   | catchment modelling  | 596 |
| Table A7.2.       | Key areas of future research and development for estuarine response modelling          | 596 |
| Table A7.3.       | Non-urban catchment modelling  | 597 |
| Table A8.1.       | Soil landscape types of the Wallis Lake catchment                                      | 605 |
| Table A8.2.       | Percentage land use in the Wallis Lake catchment                                       | 610 |
| Table A8.3.       | Broad vegetation classes of the Wallis Lake catchment                                  | 616 |
| Table A8.4.       | Endangered ecological communities of the Wallis Lake catchment                         | 616 |
| Table A8.5.       | Regionally and locally significant vegetation communities of the                       | 047 |
|                   | Wallis Lake catchment.   | 617 |
| Table A8.6.       | Examples of threatened terrestrial faunal species within the Wallis Lake establishment | 610 |
| Table A8 7        | Wallis Lake catchment management to date   | 622 |
| Table A8.8        | Riparian fencing ratio summary for the watercourses within the                         | 022 |
|                   | Wallis Lake sub-catchments.  | 626 |
| Table A8.9        | Wallamba River catchment riparian fencing  |     |
| Table A8.10       | Lower Wallamba River catchment riparian fencing  | 628 |
| Table A8.11       | Wang Wauk River catchment riparian fencing   | 628 |
| Table A8.12.      | Coolongolook River catchment riparian fencing  | 628 |
| Table A8.13.      | Minimbah Sandbed catchment riparian fencing  | 629 |
| Table A8.14.      | Wallingat River catchment riparian fencing   | 629 |
| Table A8.15.      | Wallis Lake body catchment riparian fencing  | 629 |

| Table A8.16.<br>Table A8.17. | Summary of riparian fencing for all Wallis Lake catchment watercourses<br>Number of land parcels within each catchment where agricultural activities<br>are permissible | 629<br>630  |
|------------------------------|---|-------------|
| Table A10 1                  | Methods for defining Ecological Condition Targets   | 638         |
|                              | Dereentile oblerenbyll a concentrations for NSW lakes and estuarios   | 640         |
| Table A10.2.                 | Fercentile childrophyli-a concentrations for NSW lakes and estualles  | 040         |
| Table A10.3.<br>Table A10.4. | Short-term 'event' Ecological Condition Target values developed for the Great Lakes   | 04 1        |
| Table A10.5.                 | Long-term Ecological Condition Target values developed from the   | 041         |
|                              | 80th percentile of available data for the Myall Lakes   | 642         |
| Table A11.1.                 | Loads of nutrients from the catchment of each case study area   | 648         |
| Table A14.1.                 | Wallis Lake – Proposed remediation, protection and management support actions for this Plan, and the time frame for their implementation                                | 671         |
| Table A14.2.                 | Wallis Lake – Assumptions in costing the Water Quality Improvement Plan   | 673         |
| Table A14 3                  | Wallis Lake – Effectiveness at tranning pollutants for each level of dam condition  | 674         |
|                              | Wallis Lake – Proportion of dams at each level of dam condition   |             |
|                              | by management scenario  | 675         |
| Table A14 5                  | Wallis Lake Estimated effectiveness of dams for management scenarios  | 675         |
| Table A14.5.                 | Wallis Lake – Estimated enectiveness of dams for management scenarios   | 075         |
| Table A14.0.                 | Wallis Lake – Estimation of COSIS for remember and the dam refurbishment  | 070         |
|                              | Wallis Lake – Scenarios for Plan implementation for dam refurbishment   | 070         |
| Table A14.8.                 | Wallis Lake – Description of the levels of nutrient management scenarios  | 677         |
| Table A14.9.                 | vvaliis Lake – Proportion of total improved pasture area at each level of   | ~ <b>--</b> |
|                              | nutrient management, by management scenario   | 677         |
| Table A14.10.                | Wallis Lake – Scores and fertiliser multipliers, by nutrient management scenario  | 678         |
| Table A14.11.                | Wallis Lake – Estimation of costs for fertiliser management   | 678         |
| Table A14.12.                | Wallis Lake – Scenarios for Plan implementation for nutrient management   | 679         |
| Table A14.13.                | Wallis Lake – Description of the levels of groundcover condition scenarios  | 679         |
| Table A14.14.                | Wallis Lake – Proportion of groundcover area at each level of groundcover   | 680         |
| Table A14 15                 | Wallia Laka Estimation of costs for groundsover monogement  | 000         |
| Table A14.15.                | Wallis Lake – Estimation of costs for groundcover management  | 001         |
| Table A14.10.                | Wallis Lake – Scenarios for Plan implementation for groundcover management  | 002         |
|                              | Wallis Lake – Costing of works for remediating unsealed roads   | 084         |
| Table A14.18.                | Wallis Lake – Extent and costs of repairing stream bank erosion   | 687         |
| Table A14.19.                | wetiand protection strategy – wallis and wyall lakes  | 689         |
| Table A14.20.                | Existing and future urban areas, Wallis and Smiths lakes catchments   | 690         |
| Table A14.21.                | Urban development of Greenfield sites for the Wallis Lake catchment   | 692         |
| Table A14.22.                | Wallis Lake – Reduction in TN, TP and TSS loads with implementation of WSUD scenarios   | 693         |
| Table A14.23.                | Wallis Lake – Sub-catchments used for urban area redevelopment scenarios  | 696         |
| Table A14.24.                | Wallis Lake – Scenarios for Plan implementation for<br>urban water use management   | 697         |
| Table A14.25                 | Wallis Lake – Costs of implementing ecological monitoring program   | 700         |
| Table A15.1                  | Non-market Valuation Studies for Native Vegetation Conservation   | 713         |
| Table A15.2                  | Summary of Results of Travel Cost Studies   | 715         |
| Table A15.3                  | Agricultural Output Values in the Great Lakes Statistical Local Area  | 719         |
| Table A15.4                  | Potential Benefits and Costs of the Wallis Lake WQIP  | 723         |
| Table A15.5                  | Direct Program Costs  | 723         |
| Table A15.6                  | Wallis Lake Benefit Cost Analysis Results   | 726         |
| Table A15.7                  | Sensitivity Testing on River Health Values  | 727         |
| Table A15.8                  | Wallis Lake WOIP BCA of Individual Actions  | 728         |
| Table A15.0                  | Potential Benefits and Costs of the Smiths Lake WOIP  | 730         |
| Table $\Delta 15.0$          | Direct Program Costs of the Official Earce Weil   | 730         |
|                              | Smithe Lake Benefit Cost Analysis Results   | 731         |
|                              | Smiths Lake WOID BCA of Individual Actions  | 731         |
| Table A15.12.                | Detential Panafita and Costa of the Mual Lakas WOID   | 725         |
| Table A15.13.                | Potential Denetits and Costs of the Drinking Water Strategy for the   | 755         |
| Table A 15.14.               | Crawford Catchment  | 736         |
| Table A15.15.                | Direct Program Costs  | 736         |
| Table A15.16.                | Myall Lakes Benefit Cost Analysis Results   | 739         |
| Table A15.17.                | Myall Lakes Benefit Cost Analysis Results – Drinking Water Strategy for the   | 740         |
| Table & 15 19                | Sensitivity Testing on Diver Health Values  | 7/1         |
| Table A15.10.                | Mual Lakes MOID BCA of Individual Actions   | 7/1         |
| Table A15.19.                | Drinking Water Strategy for the Crowford Catabaset BCA of Individual Actions  | 740         |
| Table A13.20.                | Soil landscape types of the Smithe Lake catchment   | 142         |
|                              | Land use summary for the Smithe Lake estebaint  | 750         |
|                              | Land use summary for the similar lare catching the  | 1 52        |

| Table A16.3.  | Threatened terrestrial faunal species detected in the Smiths Lake catchment        | 760   |
|---------------|--|-------|
| Table A16 4   | Dy WDWI (2000)   | 764   |
| Table A10.4.  | Smiths Lake – Calchment management to date   | . 704 |
|               | actions for this Plan and the time frame for their implementation                  | .768  |
| Table A17.2.  | Smiths Lake – Assumptions in costing the Water Quality Improvement Plan            |       |
|               | and its actions  | .769  |
| Table A17.3.  | Smiths Lake – Description for each level of groundcover                            | .770  |
| Table A17.4.  | Smiths Lake – Proportion of grazing lands at each level of groundcover condition,  |       |
|               | by management scenario   | .770  |
| Table A17.5.  | Smiths Lake – Scenarios for Plan implementation for groundcover management         | .772  |
| Table A17.6.  | Existing and future urban areas for Smiths Lake catchment                          | .774  |
| Table A17.7.  | Urban development of Greenfield sites for the Smiths Lake catchment                | .774  |
| Table A17.8.  | Smiths Lake – Scenarios for Plan implementation for Greenfield developments        | .775  |
| Table A17.9.  | Smiths Lake – Costs of implementing water-sensitive urban design devices           | . 775 |
| Table A17.10. | Smiths Lake – Scenarios for Plan implementation for water-sensitive                |       |
|               | urban design management  | . 776 |
| Table A17.11. | Smiths Lake – Costs of implementing ecological monitoring program                  | . 780 |
| Table A18.1.  | Soil landscape types of the Myall Lakes catchment                                  | .786  |
| Table A18.2.  | Land use summary for the Myall Lakes catchment                                     | . 790 |
| Table A18.3.  | Broad vegetation classes of the Myall Lakes catchment                              | .796  |
| Table A18.4.  | Endangered ecological communities of the Myall Lakes catchment                     | .796  |
| Table A18.5.  | Regionally and locally significant vegetation communities of the                   |       |
|               | Mvall Lakes catchment  | 797   |
| Table A18.6.  | Examples of threatened terrestrial faunal species within the                       |       |
|               | Myall Lakes catchment  | 798   |
| Table A18 7   | Myall Lakes catchment management to date   | 802   |
| Table A18.8   | Riparian fencing ratio summary for the watercourses within the Myall River         | . 002 |
| Table AT0.0.  | Crawford Diver and Boolombayto Crook estebaonte                                    | 206   |
| Table A10.1   | Myall Lakes land use classes represented in the Creat Lakes CCL DSS                | 010   |
| Table A19.1.  | Area and pollutant experts from the Muell Lakes out established                    | 010   |
| Table A19.2.  | Area and pollutant exports norm the Myali Lakes Sub-Catchinent                     | .014  |
| Table A 19.3. | Percentage area of target and non-target fand in the Myali Lake Sub-catchment,     | 045   |
| T-11- 440 4   | and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands                             | .815  |
| Table A19.4.  | Area and pollutant exports from the Boolambayte Creek sub-catchment                | .816  |
| Table A19.5.  | Percentage area of target and non-target land in the Boolambayte Creek             | - · - |
|               | sub-catchment, and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands              | .817  |
| Table A19.6.  | Area and pollutant exports from the Upper Myall River sub-catchment                | . 818 |
| Table A19.7.  | Percentage area of target and non-target land in the Upper Myall River             |       |
|               | sub-catchment, and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands              | . 819 |
| Table A19.8.  | Area and pollutant exports from the Crawford River sub-catchment                   | . 820 |
| Table A19.9.  | Percentage area of target and non-target land in the Crawford River                |       |
|               | sub-catchment, and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands              | . 821 |
| Table A19.10. | Area and pollutant exports from the Bombah Broadwater sub-catchment                | . 822 |
| Table A19.11. | Percentage area of target and non-target land in the Bombah Broadwater             |       |
|               | sub-catchment, and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands              | . 824 |
| Table A19.12. | Area and pollutant exports from the Lower Myall River sub-catchment                | . 824 |
| Table A19.13. | Percentage area of target and non-target land in the Lower Myall River             |       |
|               | sub-catchment, and the amount of total loads sourced from these lands              | . 825 |
| Table A20.1.  | Mvall Lakes – Proposed remediation, protection and management support              |       |
|               | actions for this Plan, and the time frame for their implementation                 | 828   |
| Table A20.2   | Mvall Lakes – Assumptions in costing the Water Quality Improvement Plan            |       |
| 100107 (20.2. | and its actions  | 829   |
| Table A20.3   | Mvall Lakes – Effectiveness at transing pollutants for each level of dam condition | 830   |
|               | Myall Lakes – Encentreness at happing pointains for each level of dam condition.   | . 000 |
|               | by management according  | 021   |
| Table ADD E   | by management scenario   | 001   |
|               | Myall Lakes – Estimated electiveness of dams for management scenarios              | .032  |
| Table A20.6.  | Myall Lakes – Estimation of costs for remediation of dams                          | .832  |
|               | Myall Lakes – Scenarios for Plan implementation for dam returbishment              | . 833 |
| Table A20.8.  | Myall Lakes – Description of the levels of nutrient management scenarios           | . 833 |
| Table A20.9.  | Myall Lakes – Proportion of total improved pasture area at each level of nutrient  |       |
|               | management, by management scenario   | .834  |
| Table A20.10. | Myall Lakes – Scores and fertiliser multipliers, by nutrient management scenario   | . 834 |
| Table A20.11. | Myall Lakes – Assumptions in costing the nutrient management actions               | . 834 |
| Table A20.12. | Myall Lakes – Scenarios for Plan implementation for nutrient management            | . 835 |
| Table A20.13. | Myall Lakes - Description of the levels of groundcover condition scenarios         | . 836 |
| Table A20.14. | Myall Lakes – Proportion of groundcover area at each level of groundcover          |       |
|               | management, by management scenario   | . 836 |
|               |  |       |

| Table A20.15. | Myall Lakes – Estimation of costs for groundcover management                  | . 838 |
|---------------|---|-------|
| Table A20.16. | Myall Lakes – Scenarios for Plan implementation for groundcover management    | . 838 |
| Table A20.17. | Myall Lakes – Extent and costs of repairing stream bank erosion               | . 840 |
| Table A20.18. | Wetland protection strategy. Wallis and Myall lakes                           | . 841 |
| Table A20.19. | Urban development of Greenfield sites for the Myall Lakes catchment           | . 842 |
| Table A20.20. | Myall Lakes – Costs of implementing ecological monitoring program             | . 845 |
| Table A21.1.  | Remediation actions considered for the Crawford River catchment               | . 849 |
| Table A21.2.  | Chlorophyll-a levels resulting from expanding programs                        |       |
|               | according to the Crawford Drinking Water Strategy                             | . 853 |
| Table A21.3.  | Cost (\$) per unit of load controlled by rural actions applied across the     |       |
|               | Crawford River catchment  | . 854 |
| Table A21.4.  | Summary of recommended protection and remediation management actions          |       |
|               | in the Crawford River sub-catchment   | . 854 |
| Table A21.5   | Summary of total costs of Crawford River drinking water options               |       |
|               | recommended by the Plan at seven years and 30 years                           | . 855 |
| Table A21.6.  | Crawford Drinking Water Plan benefit-cost analysis results                    | . 856 |
| Table A21.7.  | Crawford Drinking Water WQIP benefit-cost analysis of individual actions      | .857  |
| Table A21.8.  | Proportion of pasture land in each level in the Crawford River sub-catchment  | . 858 |
| Table A21.9.  | Costs specific to groundcover actions in the Crawford Drinking Water Strategy | . 858 |
| Table A21.10. | Proportion of improved pasture in each level in the                           |       |
|               | Crawford River sub-catchment  | . 859 |
| Table A21.11. | Costs specific to nutrient management in the Crawford Drinking Water Strategy | . 859 |
| Table A21.12. | Proportion of dams in each level in the Crawford River sub-catchment          | . 859 |
| Table A21.13. | Costs specific to dam actions in the Crawford Drinking Water Strategy         | . 859 |
| Table A21.14. | Costs for implementing the Crawford Drinking Water Strategy                   | . 860 |
| Table A23.1.  | Competencies of the sustainability organisation                               | . 868 |
| Table A24.1.  | Farm Scale Action Plan: Strategies to encourage landholder uptake of          |       |
|               | water quality improvement actions   | . 870 |
| Table A24.2.  | Technical strategies for water quality improvement at the farm scale          | .875  |
| Table A30.1.  | Monitoring sites for long-term targets  | .966  |
| Table A30.2.  | Monitoring program costs  | .970  |

### **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

| AnnAGNPS              | The Annualised Agricultural Non-Point Source<br>(AnnAGNPS) model simulates quantities of surface water,<br>sediment, nutrients and pesticides leaving the land areas<br>and their subsequent travel through the watershed. More<br>information on this model can be accessed from the<br>Decision Support System (DSS) Overview window.  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Benthic               | The benthic zone is the ecological region at the bottom of<br>a water body, such as a lake, and includes the surface and<br>some sub-surface layers. The organisms that live in this<br>zone are called benthos.   |
| Catchment Action Plan | A Catchment Action Plan is used to guide investment to<br>protect and improve the natural resources of a region over<br>a given period. The Hunter-Central Rivers Catchment<br>Action Plan is a 10-year plan (2006 to 2016) for better<br>coordinated and more sustainable management of the<br>regions natural resources. It identifies the key natural<br>resource features that require protection and improvement,<br>and outlines the best ways to do this.   |
| Catchment load        | The amount of nutrient or sediment that the estuary model predicts will not cause exceedance of Ecological Condition Targets.  |
| Chlorophyll-a         | Chlorophyll-a is one type of the green pigment found in<br>plants known as chlorophyll. Measurements of chlorophyll-<br>a concentrations in a waterbody are used to estimate algal<br>biomass and to assess biological productivity.   |
| Conceptual framework  | Conceptual frameworks in the Great Lakes DSS show the<br>relationship between land use and management actions,<br>and community values. An initial framework, developed<br>during the review phase, was presented to stakeholders<br>for discussion, and to ensure that management actions<br>and community values associated with the lake and its<br>catchment were included. The participatory activities were<br>used to refine the conceptual framework and to clarify the<br>types of actions to be included in the DSS. |

| DCP                             | Development Control Plans (DCPs) supplement LEPs and<br>are detailed guidelines that define controls that apply to a<br>particular type of development or in a particular area.   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| DSS                             | There is no universally accepted definition of Decision<br>Support System (DSS), although in its most general form a<br>DSS is a tool to support decision-making. They are often<br>computer-based tools that allow users to explore current<br>and alternative options for managing the system of<br>interest. DSS developed at iCAM tend to feature three<br>main components: |
|                                 | Data base – numerical and/or qualitative information that helps users familiarise themselves with the study system and to explore the impacts of different options.   |
|                                 | Model base – the models used to manipulate data and generate output from user-defined actions. Data stored in the data base are input to, or created by, the model base.  |
|                                 | Interface – the DSS interface allows user to navigate<br>through the tool, run the models and view outputs. The<br>interface is kept separate from the model base to facilitate<br>the use of the DSS by users who are not familiar with<br>programming and computer models.  |
|                                 | More information on the Great Lakes DSS can be accessed from the DSS Overview window.   |
| Ecological Condition<br>Targets | Numerical levels or descriptive statements that must be<br>met to maintain environmental values. In the Great Lakes<br>CCI, project condition targets have been set for<br>chlorophyll-a and turbidity.   |
| Environmental value             | The value or use of the water that we wish to protect.  |
| Hydrodynamic model              | In the CCI project, a computer-based hydrodynamic model<br>was developed for each lake system. The model shows<br>where water (and water-borne, catchment-derived matter)<br>goes, and how long it stays there. The model is driven by<br>the physics of the system and considers wind, tides and<br>catchment inflows.   |

| Indicator                            | A characteristic used to provide a measure of the condition of ecosystem or quality of water.  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| LEP                                  | Local Environmental Plans (LEPs) are the principal legal<br>document at the council level for controlling the use and<br>development of land. LEPs are prepared by councils and<br>approved by the Minister after public exhibition of the plan.   |
| Light attenuation                    | Light attenuation determines how fast the light intensity<br>decreases with distance from objects and is measured as<br>an exponential loss rate per metre. It quantifies the amount<br>of light that is available for photosynthesis.   |
| Littoral rainforest                  | A type of rainforest that occurs within the influence of the<br>sea or a large coastal water body (e.g. lake or estuary).<br>This vegetation type is protected in New South Wales<br>under SEPP 26.  |
| Macroalgae                           | Algae that are not microscopic. The body of the plant can be seen easily with the eye.   |
| Macrophyte                           | An aquatic plant that grows in or on the water and can be free-floating, submergent or emergent.   |
| MUSIC                                | MUSIC (Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement<br>Conceptualisation) is designed to simulate urban<br>stormwater systems operating across a range of temporal<br>(minutes to daily) and spatial (0.01 km <sup>2</sup> to 100 km <sup>2</sup> ) scales,<br>and was developed by the Cooperative Research Centre<br>for Catchment Hydrology – Urban Stormwater Quality<br>Program. The model has been designed for urban<br>stormwater engineers, planners, policy staff and managers<br>in consultancies and state, regional and local government<br>agencies. More information on the use of MUSIC in the<br>CCI project can be accessed from the DSS Overview<br>window. |
| Potential for<br>eutrophication (PE) | The potential for excessive plant growth to occur in a water<br>body. It provides a measure of the risk of negative<br>outcomes such as nuisance algal blooms, transition to<br>phytoplankton dominance, more turbid waters and muddy<br>foreshores. The concentration of material in the water<br>column that might, at some time, be used for primary  |

|                             | production is a reasonable indicator of PE. In the estuary<br>models developed for the Great Lakes CCI project,<br>nitrogen concentration in the water column is considered<br>to be a measure of PE. |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Riparian vegetation         | Riparian vegetation is the vegetation on land adjoining, directly influencing or influenced by a stream.  |
| Secchi depth                | The depth that a 20 cm weighted black-and-white disk can<br>be seen into a water column, and is a measure of water<br>clarity.  |
| SEPP                        | State Environment Planning Policies (SEPP) are policies<br>proposed by the Minister and approved by the Governor.<br>SEPPs address matters of state significance.                                     |
| Total Nitrogen              | A measure of all forms of nitrogen (e.g. nitrate, nitrite,<br>ammonia-N and organic forms) exported from lands or<br>present in a water body.   |
| Total Phosphorus            | A measure of all forms of phosphorus (e.g. dissolved,<br>particulate) exported from lands or present in a water<br>body.  |
| Total Suspended<br>Sediment | Total amount of suspended material in a water column, and is a measure of water clarity.  |

### **ABBREVIATIONS**

| AHD      | Australian Height Datum                             |
|----------|---|
| ALUM     | Australian Land Use and Management                  |
| AnnAGNPS | Annualised Agricultural Non-Point Source Pollution  |
|          | model   |
| ARI[DG9] | Average return interval                             |
| ASRIS    | Australian Soil Resource Information System         |
| AUSRIVAS | Australian River Assessment System                  |
| BASIX    | NSW Building Sustainability Index                   |
| BMP      | Best management practice                            |
| BOD      | Biological oxygen demand                            |
| CCI      | Coastal Catchments Initiative                       |
| СМА      | Catchment Management Authority                      |
| CRCCH    | Cooperative Research Centre for Catchment Hydrology |
| CRP      | Current recommended practice                        |
| DAGS     | Mid Coast Dairy Advancement Group                   |
| DCP      | Development Control Plan                            |
| DECC     | Department of Environment and Climate Change        |
| DIN      | Dissolved inorganic nitrogen                        |
| DIPNR    | Department of Infrastructure. Planning and Natural  |
|          | Resources (no longer current)                       |
|          | Department of Natural Resources                     |
| DON      | Dissolved organic nitrogen                          |
| DoP      | Department of Planning                              |
| DPI      | Department of Primary Industries                    |
| DSS      | Decision Support System                             |
| DWE      | Department of Water and the Environment             |
| EPA      | Environmental Protection Authority                  |
| EP&A Act | Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979      |
|          | (NSW)   |
| GIS      | Geographical information system                     |
| GLC      | Great Lakes Council                                 |
| GLLEP    | Great Lakes Local Environmental Plan                |
| GSC      | Gloucester Shire Council                            |
| GTCC     | Greater Taree City Council                          |
| HCRCMA   | Hunter-Central Rivers Catchment Management          |
|          | Authority   |
| ICOLL    | Intermittently closed and opened lake or lagoon     |
| ISO      | International Standards Organisation                |
| km       | Kilometres  |
| LEP      | Local Environmental Plan                            |
| m        | Metres  |
| MCW      | MidCoast Water                                      |
| MoU      | Memorandum of Understanding                         |
| MUSIC    | Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement              |
|          | Conceptualisation                                   |
| Ν        | Nitrogen  |
| NHT      | Natural Heritage Trust                              |
| NPWS     | National Parks and Wildlife Service (NSW)           |
| NRM      | Natural resource management                         |
| NSW      | New South Wales                                     |
| NTU      | Nephelometric turbidity units                       |
| OAQC     | Oyster Assurance Quality Control                    |

| OSM       | On-site Sewage Management                            |
|-----------|--|
| Р         | Phosphorus   |
| POEO Act  | Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997    |
|           | (NSW)  |
| REP       | Regional Environmental Plan                          |
| SALIS     | Soil and Landscape Information System                |
| SEPP      | State Environmental Planning Policy                  |
| SOE       | State of the Environment                             |
| SoJI      | Statements of Joint Intent                           |
| SPADE Pro | Soil Profile Attribute Data Environment Professional |
| TN        | Total nitrogen                                       |
| TP        | Total phosphorus                                     |
| TSS       | Total suspended solids                               |
| μg/L      | Micrograms per litre                                 |
| WQIP      | Water Quality Improvement Plan                       |
| WSUD      | Water Sensitive Urban Design                         |