



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

MINUTES

Meeting 6/9

18 November 2022

09:00 – 12:00hrs

Ground Floor Training Rooms, Emergency Services Headquarters

Attendance	Mr Brett Loughlin	Chair (<i>ex officio</i>)
	ACO Anthea Howard	Executive Officer
	Mr Ivan-Tiwu Copley <i>OAM JP</i>	Member, Attorney-General's Department – Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (AGD-AAR)
	Mr Andrew Cadd (<i>online</i>)	Member, Country Fire Service Volunteers Association (CFS VA)
	Ms Fiona Gill	Member, Department for Environment and Water (DEW)
	Ms Elena Petrenas (<i>online</i>)	Member, Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA)
	Ms Monique Blason (<i>online</i>)	Member, ForestrySA
	Mr Michael Garrod	Member, Landscape SA
	Mr Bill McIntosh (<i>online</i>)	Member, Outback Communities Authority (OCA)
	Mr Don Gilbertson	Deputy, Primary Producers SA (PPSA)
	A/DCO Peter Button	Member, SA Metropolitan Fire Service (SAMFS)
	C/Supt John De Candia APM	Deputy, South Australia Police (SAPOL)
	Mr James Crocker	Member, SA Water
Apologies	Ms Kylie Egan	Member, Bureau of Meteorology (BOM)
	Mr Mark Anolak	Deputy, Bureau of Meteorology (BOM)
	Mr Mark Ashley	Member, Conservation Council of South Australia (CCSA)
	Ms Justine Drew	Member, Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA)
	Ms Sarah Reachill	Member, Native Vegetation Council (NVC)
	Ms Merridie Martin	Deputy, NVC
	Mr Troy Fountain	Member, Planning and Land Use Services, Department for Trade and Investment (PLUS-DTI)
	Mr Peter White	Member, PPSA
	AC Stuart McLean	Member, SAPOL
Observers and Guests	Ms Alexis Kohlmorgen (<i>online</i>)	Observer, Department of Infrastructure and Transport (DIT)
	Ms Heidi Greaves	Observer, Local Government Association of SA (LGA SA)
	Mr Adam Schutz (<i>online</i>)	Observer, NVC
	ACO Alison May	Observer, SA Country Fire Service (SACFS)
	Ms Paula Slutzkin	Administrative Support, SACFS



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

1. Welcome

The Chair (Mr Loughlin) welcomed attendees and opened the meeting at 9.05am. He introduced himself to the Committee as Chair, and then invited Mr Copley *OAM JP* to give a Welcome to Country.

Mr Crocker (SA Water) joined the meeting at 9.09am

The Chair then noted observers and remote attendees.

2. Apologies

The Chair noted observers, and attendees online, noting that SACFS, DIT, and LGASA had observers in attendance as these agencies have vacancies due to the resignation of the Member. He then noted apologies received.

The Chair noted the prediction that looking at past patterns, it is likely two years until the next major fire season in South Australia, and emphasised the importance of the Committee continuing to function at a high-level to move the preparedness and the tenure-blind approach to preparation and planning forward in this two-year period.

3. Safety Briefing

The Executive Officer outlined the evacuation procedures for the building and the location of exit and meeting points.

4. Declaration of Conflict of Interest/Probity Matters

The Chair asked for a declaration of any Conflicts of Interest or Probity Matters, and asked that any conflicts be raised, or if they arose throughout the course of the meeting be declared and managed at that point in time. None were raised at the outset.

5. Confirmation of Previous Minutes of Meeting

The draft minutes of the State Bushfire Coordination Committee (SBCC) meeting of 19 August 2022 were considered for confirmation.

The Committee resolved as follows:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 August 2022 are confirmed as a true and correct record.

Moved: C/Supt. John De Candia *APM*

Seconded: A/DCO Peter Button

Carried.

6. Business Arising from the Minutes

6.1 Status Report

The Chair referred to the briefing note circulated and invited the Executive Officer to provide a verbal



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

update.

6.1.1 SBCC Membership

The Executive Officer noted that Mr John Moyle (LGA SA) has retired, and reiterated that the Chair's note that as per advice from Cabinet and the Crown, when a Member on this committee resigns, the Deputy to the Member position automatically falls vacant. She noted Ms Heidi Greaves (LGA SA) attending as an Observer.

The Executive Officer informed the Committee that Mr Graeme Brown (DIT) has also resigned from the SBCC due to moving to another agency, and as such Ms Alexis Kohlmorgen is attending online as an observer for DIT.

Similarly, ACO Alison May is attending as an Observer for SACFS, given the resignation of the Member who has become Chief Officer of SACFS and subsequently is now *ex officio* Chair of the SBCC.

The requests for nominations have been sent, and the nominations will be progressed with the Minister's Office and with the relevant organisations.

Correspondence has been sent to these agencies requesting nominees. This has been held as per request from LGA SA due to council elections, to provide LGAs with the opportunity to identify nominees.

6.1.2 Australian Fire Danger Rating System Update

The Executive Officer noted the update on the Australian Fire Danger Rating System (AFDRS) provided by the AFDRS project team within SACFS. She noted that there is still much to do with regard to developing a longer term transition plan for the implementation. Early implementation has been very focused on the community messaging and the emergency elements of the system; there is a long-term transition to occur, in terms of embedding a range of rules, by-laws, regulations and practises across a wide range of agencies to support AFDRS in the medium- to long-term. There has been some specific work done with regard to the grain harvesting code of practice.

The Chair noted that there has been some media around concern from the Grain Producers Association of SA (GPSA) with regard to the fire behaviour indices and how they correlate or conflict with the old grass fire danger index. GPSA have been concerned that there could be confusion amongst growers over the transition. The SACFS and GPSA have met a number of times, and have now released a joint statement which confirms that the same weather data into calculators for each of the Grass Fire Danger Index (GFDI) and the Fire Behaviour Index (FBI), the result will be comparable. So, where previously producers might have ceased harvest at a GFDI of 35; if they are using the FBI under the new AFDRS system, they will get an FBI of 40, which is the revised trigger to cease harvest.

The Committee resolved as follows:

That the State Bushfire Coordination Committee note the status report provided on matters arising from



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

the Minutes of the meeting held 19 August 2022.

Moved: A/DCO Peter Button

Seconded: Mr Michael Garrod

Carried.

7. Correspondence

The Chair referred to the correspondence list, and noted that the correspondence regarding the Risk Reduction Planning development process sent to multiple agencies had been rolled into single general items on the list, as it was not feasible to note these individually due to the high volume of items of correspondence.

The Committee considered and noted the correspondence list. No questions or comments were raised.

7.1 KI BMC Landscape Treatment Investigation Areas Pilot

The Executive Officer noted that the Chair of the Kangaroo Island Bushfire Management Committee (KI BMC) has written to the SBCC seeking support in relation to a proposal that has been adopted by the KI BMC, which is to undertake a review of what have been termed Landscape Treatment Investigation Areas (LTIAs).

This is a process that has emerged historically because the existing bushfire management planning software does not provide for the ability to do landscape-level bushfire risk assessments. As a result of this, DEW has historically utilised the fire management planning process that it has in place to rate landscape risk, particularly in the context of supporting the implementation of the Burning on Private Land (BoPL) program. Broad areas of the landscape that are at high risk of bushfire impact have been identified; and then discussions have occurred with landholders in those areas. The process targets risk reduction treatment, and identifies landholders who are happy to have burning undertaken on their properties.

The KI BMC are keen to apply this process to review potential burns on private land on KI, particularly because some of the areas that have previously been identified have either been burnt in 2019-20, or there is a need to adjust the risk profile as a consequence of the impacts of the 19-20 fires. The KI BMC has proposed a small review working group attached to the BMC as a pilot project which is being driven by DEW; and they are asking for the SBCC's support for that process.

The Executive Officer brought to the attention of the committee that in the event that the software solution that SACFS is pursuing to support the next generation of the Bushfire Management Area Plans (BMAPs) is implemented, that concept of landscape-level treatment investigation areas is not likely to be needed in future, because the new software will support landscape risk assessment whereas the current systems does not.

The outputs of this review process will only be recorded in the BMAPs in terms of actual proposed activities. Once the investigation process has been undertaken and concrete proposals have been concluded with different landholders, the burns that result from that will then be recorded in the BMAP for KI (or others as required).

Ms Gill (DEW) clarified the intentions of the proposal, that it would be seeking confirmation of the LTIAs,



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

and that this would go in the BMAP risk register – not the individual burns. These would go in DEW's annual risk reduction plan instead. What is being sought is for the BMC to agree that these LTIA's (large landscape areas) have high risk parts to it that should be investigated further, which then gives a mandate to be able to sit down with landholders to discuss being identified by the BMC as being in a high-risk area, and the potential for a risk reduction treatment activity being undertaken on their land.

In response to a question regarding whether the BMC and SBCC's approval is needed for this, Ms Gill noted that the BoPL program should not just be DEW's view of the world but should be driven by and based on areas that the BMC recognises as being of high risk. It is important for the government that the BoPL program is driven by risk identified through a BMAP process; and unfortunately because the current BMAPs don't allow for landscape-risk, this process has to be added on top of it. This gives the legal and community mandate to have a conversation about having been identified as owning property that could contribute to reducing risk to the community. Being part of this is, of course, entirely voluntary.

The Executive Officer suggested that there is a two-step process. The BMC would need to endorse in principle essentially a risk assessment of an area of the landscape – providing top cover from a BMC perspective that there is agreement on the area of extreme or high risk and that activities should be targeted there. Then what is captured as a risk reduction treatment activity within the risk register (and therefore the risk reduction plans) is what provides the legal coverage. In terms of legal liability questions, it is the latter that is the critical piece.

She also clarified that the BMAP risk registers are still being maintained, even though the visualisation / mapping of the plans has been frozen.

In response to a request for clarification on the legal elements of this, the Executive Officer noted difficulties in the prescribed burning space, because the *Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005* (FES Act) does not provide any mandate to undertake prescribed burning activities. As such there is only the ability to infer from the existing terms of the legislation that prescribed burning can be undertaken, so the only way that coverage can be provided for prescribed burns to be undertaken in the context of bushfire management planning activity is to ensure that they are specifically included in the BMAP. If prescribed burns are undertaken under permit, there is a coverage through this; but if they are undertaken outside of the permit season (the fire danger season) then the only way to provide coverage under the existing terms of the FES Act is to ensure that they are specifically included in the BMAPs.

The Chair thanked the committee for the discussion, and noted it is great to see a BMC considering their risk strategically and seeking to expand and take this on, particularly in an area as vulnerable as Kangaroo Island.

The Committee resolved as follows:

That the State Bushfire Coordination Committee support the KI BMC's proposed Landscape Treatment Investigation Area Review pilot.

Moved: C/Supt. John De Candia APM

Seconded: A/DCO Peter Button

Carried.



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

8. Business items

8.1 State Bushfire Management Plan 2021-2025 – Implementation Update

The Executive Officer referred to the briefing note circulated regarding the implementation of the *State Bushfire Management Plan 2021-2025*.

8.1.1 Interim BMAP Process – Annual Bushfire Risk Reduction Planning

The Executive Officer noted that this time last year the SBCC endorsed the adjustment to the BMC meeting framework, seeking to change the way that BMCs were engaging with BMAPs. Rather than the standard format that has been used for much of the last decade, the structure endorsed was three key meetings for the BMCs in 2022: a meeting focused on post-season review (for which the SBCC considered the summary report earlier in the year); a workshop around annual bushfire risk reduction planning; and a meeting focused around pre-season coordination.

The risk reduction planning session was intended to re-engage member agencies who have risk reduction treatment activities identified for delivery within the BMAPs. Part of the impetus for this has come from a desire from Parliament to have much more transparent reporting process around what risk reduction activities are actually being delivered through this process.

The intention for the risk reduction plans (RRPs) was to come up with a manageable exercise for an annual planning process, knowing that the data contained in the BMAPs has some limitations. The RRP focused on assets rated as being at very high or extreme risk from bushfire across the BMAPs. All organisations were asked to turn their attention towards what they proposed to do in relation to these assets, and which they planned to prioritise, for the 2022-23 financial year.

As the briefing note states, there were 60 organisations with risk reduction actions related to these assets; and as such 60 agency-level RRP. Of these, 46 (77%) have been signed off at a Chief Executive (CE) level; with a few pending approval.

Twenty-two of the organisations (37%) proactively engaged with the process, by going through the plan documents and providing specific responses to the information contained in them before the sign-off stage – whether independently or with the support of the SACFS Bushfire Management Planning Unit (BMPU). Some further organisations engaged in the process when the CEs were asked to sign off on the RRP. However, there were 11 organisations (18%) who did not engage in the process at all.

The RRP are an aggregation of the individual RRP of all of the member agencies who are responsible for the delivery of activities under each BMAP. The RRP are ready to go out to the BMCs for their consideration, as the BMCs have an assurance role under the FES Act – to make sure that the BMAPs are being implemented in a consistent manner. The BMCs will consider these and identify if there are any issues; noting that the BMCs have no power to direct individual organisations, which is why CEs have been asked to sign off on the plans for each agency.

Once the BMCs have considered these (utilising the out-of-session voting process), by the 2nd December 2022, each of the nine RRP will be provided to the SBCC for final review and



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

endorsement out-of-session.

As part of the process, staff within BMPU have also commenced a review process to identify lessons from this process this year, because it is the first time it has been done, and there have been challenges with the process for all participants.

The Executive Officer noted the importance of emphasising the key positive outcome, which is that we have produced these RRP's for the first time. As such, once these plans are signed off, we have the opportunity to report against the activities identified in each of the nine plans.

However, the challenges in the process have been two-fold: among the member organisations as well as some internal issues within SACFS with supporting the process.

In terms of member organisations, the salient issue has been agencies accepting responsibility for delivering bushfire risk reduction activities within their area of responsibility, with a very mixed uptake. Significant education has been needed to engage many of the agencies in the process. It is apparent that the level of attention that a large number of organisations have given to the bushfire management process over a long period of time has not been where we would have hoped it would be. This indicates that this process is still at a relatively low level of maturity, despite having been in place for over 10 years.

The second main issue is around governance, and the need for many agencies to look at their internal governance arrangements around bushfire management and planning and delivery. The Executive Officer notes that Mr Moyle (LGA SA) registered his concern at the previous meeting that there isn't always congruence between a representative on a BMC and corporate position of their organisation. This became very apparent through the CE approval process, where representatives were greatly surprised that the CE was engaged.

SACFS also acknowledges that there are some significant challenges in providing consistent executive support for the BMCs, which still need to be worked through. It is acknowledged that this has impacted business continuity and stakeholder engagement.

It appears that the biggest frustration for some stakeholders continues to be around ownership allocation. There are many errors BMAP data is relation to assets ownership, and some errors were still being flushed out through the RRP process. These can only really been addressed through automated analytics proposed in the generation of BMAPs. It is a function of the fact that when these BMAPs were put together in very compressed timeframes, data gathering and entry was a manual process, based on conversations around who owns what – without capacity for verification against the cadastral data.

The Executive Officer noted that once endorsed, the RRP's will be published on the SBCC website, on each BMC's landing page.

In response to a question regarding the coordinated actions, the Executive Officer noted that amendments to the collaborative actions, undertaken through discussion with specific organisations, have been completed.

In response to concerns about the out-of-session vote taking place prior to Christmas, the



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

Committee agreed to have a shortened time for consideration of the RRP, and to bring the vote forward.

Ms Gill (DEW) noted that developing the RRP has involved developing a new process that is a lot of work for the BMC member agencies, and suggested developing a working group under the SBCC to support SACFS in taking the learnings from this year and integrating them to ensure that the process support the BMCs better through the process. She noted that the responsibility for this process shouldn't sit with SACFS alone, and that it may support the development of a richer process if SBCC member agencies contribute to the integration of the learnings.

The Chair welcomed the feedback and noted that when the BMCs were established, they were designed to have high-level representation from their member agencies, and at that point there were Chief Executives or senior executive directors attending. As witnessed with the SBCC, that level of engagement tapered off. Whilst this has been addressed and reinvigorated at the state level, it stands out very clearly that the same level of representation has not translated to the nine BMCs. He proposed that the SBCC write to BMC member organisations CEOs, reiterating the legislative responsibilities that they have in these committees and recommending that they seek to elevate their membership. As a result of this process, we know that some of the very well-meaning members on these BMCs who have very limited budget or approval authority. It is clear that in order to get the best result from this process, the right level of representation is needed.

Mr Garrod (LandscapeSA) expressed surprise that 11 organisations with risk reduction activities against them did not engage at all in the process, and suggested that the SBCC should consider how to address this issue – not to punish those that didn't engage, but to gain further understanding of the impediments to their engagement.

The Chair suggested directly engaging with these 11 BMC member organisations about their engagement in this legislative process.

Mr Gilbertson (PPSA) reiterated the importance of getting the right people at the table in BMCs. However, he suggested that having CEOs at the table comes with its own issues, as they won't have fire prevention knowledge.

The Chair noted that there is significant difference across the BMC in the knowledge and authority of members and the functioning of the committees as a whole. He suggested that the level of the member within the organisation would inevitably differ depending on the size of councils; and that it may not need to be the Chief Executive sitting in the room, but that they need to be better briefed and more aware about what is occurring at the meetings. He also noted that where it comes to local government, the legislation doesn't accept any variance, and so it is the CEOs who are ultimately exposed through non-compliance in this process.

Mr Crocker (SA Water) noted that it is about having the right representatives there; and about having the right governance and awareness within the organisations. SBCC cannot control organisational governance processes, but needs to ensure that whoever is there has the authority to be committing to things. He suggested that members on the BMCs need to have an understanding of fire management, which in some organisations could be quite removed from senior leadership.



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

In response to a question, the Executive Officer clarified that the majority of the 11 organisations that did not engage were local government; but that there was no clear pattern across the BMCs in terms of the size of the organisation and the level of engagement.

The Committee resolved as follows:

That the State Bushfire Coordination Committee note the report on risk reduction planning to date, and approve an out of session vote to endorse the risk reduction plans, with the plans to be circulated to the Committee for review and consideration by 9 December 2022 ahead of the vote taking place from 15-16 December 2022.

Moved: Mr Michael Garrod

Seconded: Ms Fiona Gill

Carried.

8.1.2 Pre-season Coordination Report Summary

The Executive Officer noted that the pre-season coordination process was somewhat fragmented, several BMC meetings has needed to be rescheduled or deferred; and one had to manage the reporting process out-of-session. There was a lot of non-completion of the pre-season report templates. The intent of this session was to get BMC member organisations around the table to talk about opportunities for collaboration, develop a shared understanding of the key risks in their Bushfire Management Area (BMA) and discuss what the individual organisations were planning to address these for the coming season. The organisations that did complete reports were very individually focused, and the reports back from the meetings is that discussions were also very individually focused – so the intended outcome of collaboration wasn't achieved.

However, there were some common key points of concern raised across multiple areas, which are summarised in the briefing, such as: ongoing grass growth, and the continuation of risk reduction works well into the season due to late rains. There were also concerns raised about regulations governing the management of green waste, particularly following the fallout from recent extreme weather events; and also around native vegetation and declared weed management, where there is ongoing confusion regarding who is responsible for this. Many organisations identified that staff turnover has impacted capability and resourcing; which appears to be a market-wide issue. Also of note, training for the new Fuel-State Editor (as part of the new AFDRS) is still underway for fire prevention officers within local government, so there is not full coverage at the moment in relation to the information that is being fed into the Fuel State Editor.

The Executive Officer highlighted the leaflet from Wudinna District Council, noting that this is a fantastic piece of basic communication. The Chair asked LGA SA to pass back the feedback to Wudinna District Council, noting that it emphasises that it is not only the larger councils with many staff are able to achieve some really good outcomes. It is also an example of a council that recognises its legislative responsibilities and is doing something about this.

In relation to the pre-season coordination meeting, the Executive Officer noted that the issues with executive support within the BMCs had a very significant impact on the outcome, and as such the responsibility does primarily sit with SACFS, with a significant impact of staff changeover



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

and continuity.

8.1.3 BMAP 2.0 Update

The Executive Officer informed the committee that SACFS continues to work towards identifying resourcing options to progress the software uplift for the next generation of BMAPs.

The Chair noted that the SACFS has a meeting with government in order to highlight the importance of this project, with a view to getting some commitment to a pathway for this funding. Updates will be provided to the committee as this continues. However, it is nice to see this level of interest and engagement from the Minister, who has been clear that he supports actions for community resilience and risk reduction. The Minister has made it very clear that the current government is heavily invested in climate change, and understand that with a changing climate comes an increased risk of natural disasters, and so they want to be better prepared for that.

The Executive Officer referred to the attached report from the user requirements scoping survey for the Bushfire Management Planning and Reporting Software (BMPRS) project that was commenced in May 2022, and acknowledged the great work of Ms Danielle Drever in supporting the steering committee and the project as a whole. She pointed out that the report included some very interesting observations, many of which support the earlier discussion on the RRP process. However, these results also reinforce the limitations of the current information, and particularly that it is not benchmarked against residual risk. It emphasises the system requirements end users are seeking, and that there needs to be a sound scientific basis, in terms of the understanding of fire behaviour and land management activities, economic and social analysis, and cultural inclusion within the framework that is being used for the analytics. There is also a lot of concern (that has been anticipated) that this system be intuitive and easy to use.

8.1.4 Governance Review Update

The Executive Officer noted that this is not as far along as had hoped. However, SACFS staffing changes throughout 2022 have impacted this greatly. She noted that a prospective consultant to undertake this work has been identified. Given shortfalls in SACFS internal capacity required to support the consultation needed for this review, the component of the project devoted to consultation has had to be increased, which has resulted in triggering a procurement process due to exceeding the base threshold.

This procurement process is currently underway, and it is expected that there will be a contractor on deck early in the new year to commence this.

The Chair noted that for a long time the intention has been to complete this review in-house, and noted the value of having this outsourced.

The Committee resolved as follows, with reference to items 8.1.2, 8.1.3, and 8.1.4:

That the State Bushfire Coordination Committee note the summary report on key issues arising in pre-season preparation.



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

That the State Bushfire Coordination Committee note the update on BMAP 2.0, including the BMPRS User Requirements Survey Results Report.

The Committee is asked to note the briefing regarding the governance review.

Moved: C/Supt. John De Candia APM

Seconded: Mr Ivan Copley OAM JP

Carried.

8.2 SBCC 2021-2022 Annual Report

The Chair noted that the SBCC 2021-2022 Annual Report was tabled in parliament on the 18th October. The Executive Officer noted that it is now published on the website.

In response to a question regarding the proposed 2022-2023 Annual Report process, the Executive Officer noted that as with the previous two reports, it is likely that the draft template will be brought to the SBCC prior to it being populated as the draft. She noted that part of the intention of the RRP is to simplify the annual reporting process, so the components of part two of the Annual Report (in which all BMC member organisations contributed to the report in their own right) will likely be replaced with reporting against the RRP. The broad intent is that the RRP becomes a very direct component of the annual reporting requirement, which is to report on the delivery of the BMAPs.

The Chair noted that from a number of committees across agencies there is a constant theme agencies are surprised by requirements that come around annually. Hopefully the committee will be better prepared for the next annual report, given that we now have templates and frameworks that did not exist in the past.

8.3 Flinders Mid North Yorke and Outback BMAs – Boundary Amendment

The Chair noted that it has long been an issue that the boundaries of the Flinders Mid North Yorke (FMNY) and Outback BMCs have been unwieldy, and feedback from these committees is that this has led to challenges, such as membership issues, which have impacted the functioning of the committees.

The Executive Officer noted that at last meeting the committee was informed that the Outback BMC had met and put forward a proposal, and this was waiting on FMNY BMC to discuss the matter. What is now presented are the respective recommendations of these two BMCs, and the documents containing the commentary are attached in full with the papers.

Both committees landed on proposals with a significant degree of overlap, with both BMCs having one council either side that they had chosen to include that the other hadn't.

It is recommended to the Committee that it endorse a proposal to the Minister that the boundary adjustment includes the common councils that both BMCs identified be removed into the Outback BMC and into the FMNY BMC. This will also align to the Fire Ban District for the Flinders.

This proposal will leave the City of Whyalla (which had been put forward by the Outback BMC for inclusion in its BMA, but without any consultation with the Upper Eyre Peninsula BMC at that stage) and the Regional Council of Goyder (as had been proposed by FMNY BMC for inclusion in the Outback BMA), which will not be included in the Outback BMA at this stage.



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

The core group of councils (Port Augusta City Council, Flinders Ranges Council, District Council of Mount Remarkable, District Council of Peterborough, and District Council of Orreroo Carrieton) would be moved from the FMNY BMA to the Outback BMA. This would be an 'interim' arrangement, as both BMCs have indicated that they would like wider boundary review, and FMNY would also like to review their boundary with Murray Mallee.

As previously identified, further boundary reviews are in scope of the governance review.

With regard to a question regarding the size of the Outback BMA and the possibility of creating and additional BMA, the Executive Officer noted acceptance of this commentary and its importance, but suggested that these broader matters will be considered in the governance review. This interim measure is necessary to assist the functioning of these committees.

In response to a question regarding review of the Fire Ban Districts, the Chair noted that this is well underway, and that suggestions and their implications are being considered prior to going to the SACFS Chief Officer. This will then be followed by a broader level of consultation.

Mr Cadd (CFS VA) declared a conflict of interest due to his position as Deputy to the Member on the FMNY BMC, but expressed support of the motion. Mr McIntosh (OCA) also indicated his support for the boundary amendment.

The Chair requested that the thanks of the SBCC be communicated back to the Outback and FMNY BMCs.

The Committee resolved as follows:

That the State Bushfire Coordination Committee recommend the inclusion of the Port Augusta City Council, Flinders Ranges Council, District Council of Mount Remarkable, District Council of Peterborough and Orreroo Carrieton Council in the Outback Bushfire Management Area, and their removal from the Flinders Mid North and Yorke Bushfire Management Area. Further, that the SBCC note the request from both the Outback and Flinders Mid North and Yorke BMCs to review their boundaries more generally, and advise that this review process will be considered through the review of governance, including the specific proposals provided by each BMC.

Moved: Mr Michael Garrod

Seconded: Mr James Crocker

Carried.

8.4 Bushfire Management Committee Nominations

No questions or comments were raised.

The Committee resolved as follows:

That the SBCC confirm the requested appointments as being from agencies prescribed by the SBCC in the composition of the BMCs, and appoints the persons listed to the relevant BMC for the remainder of the current three year term of BMCs.

Moved: A/DCO Peter Button

Seconded: C/Supt. John De Candia APM

Carried.



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

8.5 Agency Matters (verbal updates)

8.5.1 SA Metropolitan Fire Service

A/DCO Button (SAMFS) noted that the 'Chief Officer's intent' relates to a document that has been in circulation for some time, and is under review, as are the three SAMFS levels of preparedness documents. The Chief Officer's Intent is about the level of resources that the Chief Officer will commit to an emergency incident – for instance, where there is a large emerging incident in the metropolitan area, that there will be a reduction of coverage in other areas.

SAMFS are continuing to supplementing the fleet, with 18 new vehicles coming in over the next three years, with burn over protection to assist when supporting SACFS outside of gazetted areas.

ACO Colin Lindsay (SBCC Deputy to the Member) is commencing extended pre-retirement leave in January.

8.5.2 Department for Environment and Water

Ms Gill (DEW) noted that DEW delivers an extensive prescribed burning program in Spring and Autumn, and La Niña conditions are hampering this. The Minister for Climate, Environment and Water requested a media release regarding this, which was released the week prior to the Committee meeting, flagging to the community that there will be a significant number of burns that will have to be rolled over either to next Autumn or to the following program year. She noted that it is probably the worst Spring conditions ever seen in terms of impact on the prescribed burning program. With 46 burns planned across DEW, SA Water, and Forestry in the Limestone Coast region under MoU arrangement, and as of 11th November only 16 of these had been achieved. The intention of this media release was to calm community concern, with dissemination of the message that the risk profile of National Parks doesn't rise exponentially due to these burns not being done.

The DEW media release will be circulated to the committee by the SBCC Secretariat.

The Chair notes that achieving even 16 burns this season shows great agility from the prescribed burning team, and noted that the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water has also been verbally briefed on this.

9. Other Business

The Chair noted that on the Wednesday prior to the Committee meeting the Federal Minister for Emergency Services visited South Australia, and came and visited the Emergency Services Sector Headquarters, and visited Belair where he was briefed on some of the storm impacts. He was also briefed by SA State Emergency Service on the Murray flood event that is unfolding, and by SACFS Chief Officer about the upcoming fire season. He expressed his admiration at the collaborative approach in the sector in South Australia.

The Chair also highlighted the launch of Operation Nomad in the week prior to the Committee meeting by SAPOL and SACFS, praising this programme for its tangible impact on the number of arson incidents that occur, and expressing thanks to SAPOL for their ongoing work.

10. Meeting Close



**State Bushfire
Coordination
Committee**

The Chair declared the meeting closed at 10.47am.

Next meeting: February 2023 (to be advised).

Endorsed by the State Bushfire Coordination Committee as a true and correct record of the meeting.

Brett Loughlin AFSM
Chair, State Bushfire Coordination Committee