



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

MINUTES

Meeting 7/1

1 December 2023

09:00 – 12:00hrs

ESS Headquarters, 37 Richmond Road KESWICK

Attendance	Ms Georgie Cornish None present Mr Andrew Cadd Ms Fiona Gill Ms Laura Bruce Ms Monique Blason Mr Michael Garrod Cr Paul Yeomans Dr Cherrie DeLeiu Professor Simon Maddocks ACO Cameron Devey ACO Alison May ACFO Peter Button C/Supt John DeCandia Ms Vlora Dzeladini Dr Brooke Swaffer (<i>Teams</i>) Ms Kylie Egan Ms Kirsty Bevan Ms Sarah Elding Ms Marilyn Henderson Ms Karen Lee-Jones (<i>Teams</i>)	(acting) Chair (<i>ex officio</i>) Executive Officer Member, Country Fire Service Volunteer Association (CFSVA) Member, Department of Environment and Water (DEW) Member, Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA) Member, ForestrySA (FSA) Member, Landscape SA (LSA) Member, Local Government Association of SA (LGASA) Member, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (AAR) Member, Primary Producers SA (PPSA) Member, SA Country Fire Service (SACFS) Deputy, SA Country Fire Service (SACFS) Member, SA Metropolitan Fire Service (SAMFS) Deputy, SA Police (SAPOL) Member, SA Power Networks (SAPN) Member, SA Water (SAW) Member, Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) Member, Conservation Council of South Australia (CSA) Member, Planning and Land Use Services, Department for Trade and Investment (PLUS-DTI) Native Vegetation Council (NVC) Deputy, Department of Infrastructure and Transport (DIT)
Apologies	Ms Jan Ferguson OAM Mr Tony Vaughan Dr Ana Glavinic AC Stuart Vaughan	Member, Outback Community Authority (OCA) Deputy, Outback Community Authority (OCA) Member, Department of Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) Member, SA Police (SAPOL)
Observers and Guests	Mr Benedict Browne Mr Phill McDonough Mr Aidan Galpin Ms Danielle Drever Ms Jacqui Williams	Deputy, Primary Producers SA (PPSA) Guest presenter (SACFS) Guest presenter (SACFS) Guest (SACFS) Administrative Support, SBCC Secretariat



1. Welcome

1.1 Acknowledgement of Country

The Chair (Georgie Cornish) welcomed attendees and opened the meeting at 9:02am and gave an Acknowledgement of Country.

1.2 Apologies

The Chair noted observers, attendees online and apologies received.

1.3 Safety Briefing

The Chair provided the Safety Briefing, including an outline of evacuation procedures for the building, the location of exit and meeting points and amenities.

1.4 Recording of Meeting

The Chair reminded the Members the Meeting was to be recorded via Teams.

1.5 New Member Welcome

The Chair welcomed all new Members and Deputies to the SBCC and introduced them to the Committee.

The Chair welcomed all existing Members and Deputies to the new SBCC Term.

1.6 Induction Presentation

The Chair reminded the Committee that the Induction Presentation was included in the Meeting Package provided, for new Members and Deputies to become acquainted with the SBCC, its purposes and process in addition to providing a refresher to existing Members and Deputies.

No questions were raised. The Chair requested acknowledgement that the Members had viewed the Induction Presentation to occur after this Meeting.

2. 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.

3. Confirmation of Minutes of Previous Meeting

The draft minutes of the State Bushfire Coordination Committee (SBCC) meeting of 13 October were considered for confirmation.

The State Bushfire Coordination Committee confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2023 as a true and correct record.

Moved: C/Supt John DeCandia (SAPOL)

Seconded: AFCO Peter Button (MFS)

Carried

4. Business Arising from the Minutes

4.1 Fire Tracks Update

The Chair invited Mr Aidan Galpin (SACFS) to provide a discussion on the Fire Tracks, who noted that:

The SBCC owns the fire tracks/breaks standard document. The document needs reviewing on how it is applied, regarding standards and access by fire appliances.

DIT and DEW are part of this. The Bushfire Management Committees (BMCs) would like it updated as it is not appropriate in its current form. There needs to be a holistic system, where councils can assess the need and then work with Brigades. All of the information needs to be brought together under BMAP 2.0.

In response to a question regarding the current process, Mr Galpin noted DEW has a process for updating the data layer, but it requires a resource to update it. Its existing structure needs reviewing.

The Deputy to the Member for DIT stated that DIT are working on a bushfire risk management plan looking at the interaction between roads and tracks and seeking to work with councils on this.

Mr Galpin noted there is no formal review yet; but when it commences it needs to examine strategic fire access, with trucks moving through the landscape safety being the objective. BMAP 2.0 should help facilitate that work.

In response to an enquiry about any updates to fire tracks on private property, Mr Galpin was unsure about standards applying to private properties, as currently it is only an issue regarding land which is managed by a land management agency.

The Chair agreed it is an issue that sits within BMAP 2.0, and it could be discussed at agenda item 6.2, with consideration given to holding over to a later date to discuss.

4.2 State Bushfire Management Mid Term Review

The Chair reminded the Committee that, at the 13 October SBCC Meeting, the Chair had provided a presentation and initial discussion regarding the progress of the State Bushfire Management Mid Term Review.

Following from that discussion, the Chair requested that a “traffic light document” be provided out of session to the SBCC Members early in 2024 which will be followed by an agenda item (verbal update) at the next SBCC Meeting on 23 February 2024.

Moved: ACO Cameron Devey (SACFS)

Seconded: C/Supt John DeCandia (SAPOL)

Carried

5. Correspondence

SBCC noted the correspondence provided to 1 December 2023.

The Chair asked the Committee to note an email received from Mr Matthew Barrett from the Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC) expressing interest in having involvement with the SBCC, given its significant landholdings, infrastructure and operations within South Australia.

Committee Members requested the email be sent to the Members for their information.

The Chair requested the ARTC email be sent to the Members accordingly, with further discussion and resolution to follow at the next SBCC Meeting on 23 February 2024.

6. Business Items

6.1 SBCC Executive Officer

ACO Cameron Devey (SACFS) stated there are fiscal considerations with regard to the Executive Officer (EO) position. The SACFS is legislated to provide the Executive Officer (EO), and there is a background to discuss when considering this role. Outcomes accepted from New South Wales, particularly with regard to BMAP, which is considered a solution to bushfire management for the long term. With regard to BMAP funding, SACFS needs to provide a co-contribution to the funding to ensure all needs are met. This needs to be led by the SBCC, in terms of developing a minimum viable product to ensure BMAP is delivered.

ACO Alison May (SACFS) reinforced that view and stated it is about how the Committee runs, and the discussions need to be about the services the Committee requires. If the Committee's requirements for services extend beyond what SACFS can provide, then this needs to be discussed.

In response to a question regarding what the EO role contributed prior to May 2023, ACO May referred the committee to the information provided in the role descriptions in the Agenda Package. As it was originally considered a "side of desk" role, in the role description provided there was a red line through 80% of the role. The remainder is all SACFS can service.

ACO May explained there is a difference between the full version of the role and the short version of the role. The full version of the EO role includes:

- Expertise in South Australian legislation relating to bushfire management
- Understanding of each SBCC membership organisation
- Expertise in Committee governance
- Ensuring the SBCC Members are all understanding of each other's positions
- Managing out of session discussions
- Ensuring SBCC strategic directions are managed
- Ensuring larger, State interests are factored in to the SBCC strategies
- Maintaining Committee momentum and the capacity to deliver outcomes

The short version of the EO role includes:

- Coordination of the SBCC
- Sending packages out on time
- Understanding the relevant legislation and governance
- Meeting basic requirements, such reporting

The committee discussed the legislated standards, resourcing priorities and constraints, and whether the current capabilities of SACFS to resource the role meets the requirement of the SBCC.

Committee Members expressed concern that many functions have been removed from the role description, noting that this is probably not sufficient to support the SBCC.

The Chair noted some duplication of duties between the two role descriptions provided (the EO role and the SBCC Support Officer role). Since May 2023, the duties of the Support Officer role have increased, due to the departure of the EO role. She noted that the committee needs to now discuss requirements and decide focus is on BMAP or the EO role, and whether any funding can be shared.

A committee member noted it is difficult to accept the notion that the government's inability to fund this results in a trade-off for the SBCC, as government departments should be able to deliver legislative requirements. It was suggested that BMAP is not a core function, where the State Bushfire Management Plan (SBMP) is; and funding for BMAP 2.0 should not be at the expense of the SBMP and the SBCC.

A suggestion was made that an independent Chair is required, as this would enable an independent letter from the Committee as an engagement tool with broader Government. The Chair recommended that should members be seeking an independent Chair which would undoubtedly have governance merit, it should be discussed via their appropriate chains.

It was suggested the committee may need to consider sharing the responsibilities of the executive officer role with other SBCC Members.

The Chair suggested it needs to be established what the Committee wants, and if the current arrangements are sufficient or if more is needed. While a hard question for new Members, a collective agreement on this is a critical component to the decision-making process. Currently SACFS cannot fund additional resourcing if needed, and there is a need to ensure the basics are done.

ACO Devey suggested the recommendations in the paper provided be amended to include the feedback, to return at the next SBCC Meeting for noting.

BMAP 2.0 is a challenge for SBCC and a collective voice on concerns is important, and as such there needs to be an opportunity to review, amend and recommend. Feedback on the out of session paper prior to the next meeting would be much appreciated.

Committee members expressed discomfort at being asked to endorse a recommendation for the EO role. As it is an SACFS responsibility, the question was asked whether it is the responsibility of the Committee to decide. ACO Devey (SACFS) noted consultation is always good.

The Chair stated recommendations will be amended, and consultation will seek to establish critical services the Committee expects from SACFS, and advice on how to deliver that. SACFS will draft a paper reflecting the discussion and options, including the critical elements, and bring it back for noting.

6.2 BMAP 2.0 Update

Mr Aidan Galpin (SACFS) was invited to provide an update on BMAP 2.0 to the Committee. He gave an overview of the BMAPs. Bushfire Management Areas (BMAs) are required by legislation. There are 9 of these, each of which has a plan. An affordable software solution was developed to support these plans; however there is no longer support for this software and as such the system is now frozen. As a result, the information in the existing BMAPs has become dated.

The Keelty Review identified that BMAP 1.0 was not fulfilling the legislative requirements and thus there was a need for BMAP 2.0. The SBCC supported this, given that the software is no longer functional.

Federal funding was obtained in 2021 to deliver BMAP 2.0. A Request for Information (RFI) process was undertaken, and discovered the cost exceeded current funding. The RFI process informed the predicted cost of BMAP 2.0, including the quantitative assessment for bushfire modelling, where predictions are created from running many fires in a model in a similar manner to the Eastern States.

ACO May (SACFS) explained that BMAP 2.0 will be a public resource which empowers the public to make choices, such as choosing where to build. It is also an SBCC resource. It will be a single point of truth for risk identification going forward for everyone, including the corporate world.

In response to a question regarding whether the challenge in funding for BMAP 2.0 relates to the 50% co-contribution, ACO Devey (SACFS) confirmed that it is, and noted this is challenging for SACFS. It was an SBCC initiative built on a collaborative approach as discussed in our previous SBCC Meeting. It will require governance and other agencies contributing to BMAP 2.0 – not only with funds, but with time. This is why the project Steering Committee has been formed.

Ms Fiona Gill (DEW) asked how everyone will contribute, after it has started; and questioned whether the reason why this has become a problem is because funding has not been received.

The Chair explained it is about timing: Commonwealth and State funding occurs at the same time, and there was a hope that both would work together, this has not been the case. SACFS remains hopeful there may be some further funding, but is not yet the case.

A question was asked about whether the Commonwealth contribution will cover the software rebuild.

Professor Simon Maddocks (PPSA) stated we need to do both in parallel, as you cannot suspend the Commonwealth funding, and we need the state based funding. This is reflective of the resourcing issues for the EO role. We need to be proactive and consider levers to pull.

A question was raised about whether there is an alternative to BMAP 2.0.

Ms Sarah Elding (PLUS-DTI) commented that PLUS-DTI have completed some remodelling across the state, and suggested that this could be used. The model and data could be shared across agencies and

SACFS may be able to use this if BMAP 2.0 does not eventuate. The hazards have been worked on and remodelled from 2011/12. Data was collected with DEW, and there is a bushfire hazard mapping model from the land use and planning perspective.

ACO May noted that SACFS is aware of this and there is no desire to “reinvent the wheel”, and consideration can be given to any information that can be pooled, which will result in less cost. The issue is that the hazard overlay does not consider assets in the community. BMAP contains a rich picture of assets to be protected, ensuring that all risks are passed on to the community.

In response to a questions regarding whether that layer could be added onto the model, ACO May noted it would require powerful software to able to do that. Mr Galpin (SACFS) further added this is an excellent suggestion, we just need to understand risk: hazards and risks are not the same, but this data could inform risk and we are keen to access more data. ACO May noted SACFS is working with the Office for Data Analytics to ensure efficiency.

Ms Monique Blason (FSA) noted it is not just an asset based risk, but land and assets. The Committee needs to be open to alternatives beyond BMAP 2.0. We would need to know whether the treatment of risk is effective, and it is difficult to say. BMAP 2.0 needs to provide community assurance. It does not necessarily need to be a single system – it can be made of parts.

Ms Elding (PLUS-DTI) stated mapping and modelling will be one point of truth for land and infrastructure planning use. There will be additional data sets such as primary production land, grazing land, and high-risk areas. In response to a comment pointing out that there needs to be a focus on assets for SBCC, Ms Elding explained an asset layer could work with what they have, noting they have been talking to Infrastructure SA.

Ms Karen Lee-Jones (DIT) stated there are corridor risks, suggesting they would support the idea of measurement and effectiveness which has not really been done. There have been 3 studies on mitigations but not necessarily in high-risk areas. The second phase is measuring which is important to protect assets.

ACO May (SACFS) noted collaboration is important and can assist with the co-contribution, pointing out that all potential end users and stakeholders will have a say in the design through a collaborative process. She suggested the committee could consider going further with key stakeholder co-creation of the project: what do member agencies expect; what would their contribution look like? Time contributed could be quantified as a co-contribution.

Professor Maddocks (PPSA) agreed with this sentiment and stated this is important.

ACO May (SACFS) noted grant funding cannot be used to access more grant funding. However, developmental secondment could be considered as a co-contribution.

In response to a question regarding how far back co-contributions can be counted, ACO May noted it can only be counted from the date the project is signed off (likely the first quarter of 2024).

The Chair noted the active engagement on this and stated the key messaging is to facilitate advocacy across agencies and Ministers.

Action: Send out a table for FTE contributions around expectations, elements with estimates to start with.

Action: Ms Elding (PLUS-DTI) to provide overview presentation on their system at the next SBCC Meeting.

ACO Devey (SACFS) brought the Committees attention back to the options on page 6 of SBCC Briefing Paper 6.2. The Chair noted it was not feasible to consider all of the recommendations today, suggesting a full matrix and stronger recommendations be brought back to the next meeting.

Mr Galpin (SACFS) reminded the Committee that in 2022, the SBCC resolved to use interim Risk Reduction Plans (RRPs) until BMAP 2.0 is developed, as the existing BMAP 1.0 software containing assets cannot be updated. The assets are risk rated with ratings from low to extreme, and organisations report to the SBCC on very high to extreme risks. Landscape assets are not included, and as such activities such as prescribed burns are not captured. This cannot be updated. Reviewing this each year is inefficient, as the data is static during the interim phase. From the static RRP, report information can be sent each year to the SBCC Secretariat. It is considered unnecessary to go through a detailed process each year, as assets are static not changing. As such, a static RRP document makes sense.

Ms Gill (DEW) asked whether RRP could be paused to free up capacity for agencies, as if the process does not provide a meaningful story for Parliament, it should be changed or got rid of. The SBCC Annual Report needs to be concise and meaningful. However, she noted that the change needs to be carefully managed, especially with regard to communication with the BMCs, as it is important for the BMCs to be on board with the changes.

Mr Galpin agreed with this and questioned whether the process needs to be repeated annually. If there is no submission, we already include the very high and extreme assets on their behalf for inclusion into the Annual Report. We can apply this across everyone. It is better to maintain a static RRP so we have data for the Annual Report?

ACO May suggested a hybrid of option 1 and 2: support for the static RRP, but also reduce the scope of the Annual Report, in order for it to be more focused.

Following some discussion of the options, including members noting lack of time to consider and raise with member agency staff involved in RRP, the Chair suggested a hiatus on the RRP, with the option to confirm this out of session.

The Committee agreed that, until BMAP 2.0 is up and running, the Annual Report would be smaller and lighter and could still meet the requirements. Given resourcing issues, this would also be prudent.

The Chair suggested a reduced SBCC Annual Report that still meets requirements would be acceptable, and suggested a memo with requirements for the SBCC Annual Report could be sent for consultation out-of-session.

Discussion was had regarding the possibility of BMPRS steering committee members attending SBCC Meetings as Observers.

Ms Monique Blason (FSA) asked whether South Australian Forest Products Association (SAFPA) (part of the Forest Producers Association and represent 178,00 hectares of the south east growers) could nominate to be a part of the steering committee. They have a separate policy for the forestry industry, as they are a separate commodity group. They would like to be a part of BMAP 2.0, and they would ideally like to nominate in the future to also become an SBCC Member organisation. They are a not for profit organisation who represent growers.

Professor Maddocks (PPSA) noted they are already a member of PPSA. Ms Gill (DEW) noted that if it results in double representation it would be better for PPSA to remain the only Member from the forestry area, suggesting that forestry groups may be better in a technical working group instead.

The Chair noted the hesitation for their inclusion and suggested this be added to the out of session piece. The Committee agreed to not vote on this today.

6.3 SBCC 2022-2023 Annual Report

ACO Devey (SACFS) confirmed the SBCC Annual Report 2022-2023 was tabled in the House of Assembly on 31 October 2023. Once the stamped copy is provided to the SBCC Mailbox, it will be forwarded to the SBCC Members.

6.4 Permit Guidelines Presentation

Mr Phil McDonough (SACFS) presented to the Committee regarding burning permit guidelines.

In response to a question regarding who to notify when burning (Adelaide Fire or CFS), Mr McDonough responded by informing the Committee there is no longer a requirement to ring Adelaide Fire, although it could be an additional condition of the permit as the dispatch system develops over time. As Adelaide Fire had no capacity to manage that information, nothing resulted from them receiving the information. Further, on a local level there are also privacy concerns. In an ideal world, the gold standard would work with one database which distributed daily emails to Groups and Brigades via the GIS system in order to be able to spatially view fire information.

In response to a question regarding numbers of permits issued, Mr McDonough noted that 700 permits were issued for Wattle Range LGA alone, and there are 68 LGAs within South Australia. The estimated number of permits issued State-wide is 15,000. It is worth noting that these are permits for broad acre burning, with additional permits issued for pyrotechnics, CFS permits, and high risk fires. The agency needs to adapt to these trends.

In response to a question about paper-based contingencies, Mr McDonough noted that paper-based permits are always a contingency. He stated that there have always been requests for funding for a future system, but with no success due to the cost and the unwillingness to divert funding from volunteers.

Professor Maddocks (PPSA) commented the current system does not work, for example the requirement to let neighbours know. He suggested an electronic system may achieve this, and the smoke management policies would benefit from a new system, as currently smoke impacts are not considered at LGA level when considering issues. Mr McDonough noted permits could be turned off in those areas, and notifications provided and even permits revoked in those circumstances.

In response to a question regarding what can be done in the interim with permits issued at the time of the year when grapes are on the vines when burning is done, Mr McDonough responded that Authorised Officers can receive training and education in this area, as the CFS cannot be there for every burn.

Mr Andrew Cadd (CFSVA) stated a permit being issued does not equate to a right to burn. Mr McDonough noted it depends on conditions, and the council must be called. There may be different rules and requirements for different areas. With an electronic system, there can be a blanket approach to permits.

Mr Cadd suggested there could be a decision made on the day whether to activate a permit on any given day, with online notifications. CFS volunteers could therefore see planned burns and choose to respond to a particular burn which is out of control. The volunteers could then examine a map of planned burns to match the actual situation, with brigade responses tailored to this information on a map.

In response to a question regarding how a centralized system would work with the current system, Mr McDonough stated it would replace the current system.

Ms Fiona Gill (DEW) stated regarding the wine and grape sector, the CFS is working on this. The onus is currently on the landowner to meet the conditions. Mr McDonough noted councils are aware and pass on the requirements, and often they do not issue permits, but there are also often unplanned events.

In response to a question regarding whether the conditions need to be amended, Mr McDonough noted that conditions for smoke management do not need to be amended as the Authorising Officers are trained to mitigate this.

Ms Monique Blason (FSA) raised an issue regarding presentations at SBCC Meetings in general, noting that within the SBMP actions, there are Group Actions. She suggested that a list of coordination actions is put together, with a view to encouraging member agencies to present on these. Support needs to be provided, to encourage an information sharing program to ensure we continue this in future meetings.

The Chair agreed, noting a list could be provided to members in order to prioritise what they would like to hear about.

Ms Monique Blason (FSA) noted this is a task that would fall into the role of the Executive Officer, who would ensure these actions are continued.

6.5 2024 Meeting Dates

The Chair provided a list of 2024 Meeting dates as follows:

- Friday 23 February 2024
- Friday 24 May 2024



- Friday 16 August 2024
- Friday 15 November 2024

The Committee noted the 2024 meeting dates.

6.6 Committee Matters

6.6.1 Fire Season Dates

ACO Cameron Devey (SACFS) provided confirmation of the Fire Danger Season dates for all Fire Danger Districts:

Adelaide Metropolitan	15 November 2023	30 April 2024
Eastern Eyre Peninsula	1 November 2023	15 April 2024
Flinders	16 October 2023	15 April 2024
Kangaroo Island	15 November 2023	30 April 2024
Lower Eyre Peninsula	15 November 2023	15 April 2024
Lower South East	22 November 2023	15 April 2024
Mid North	1 November 2023	30 April 2024
Mount Lofty Ranges	15 November 2023	30 April 2024
Murraylands	1 November 2023	15 April 2024
North East Pastoral	16 October 2023	31 March 2024
North West Pastoral	16 October 2023	31 March 2024
Riverland	1 November 2023	15 April 2024
Upper South East	15 November 2023	15 April 2024
West Coast	16 October 2023	15 April 2024
Yorke Peninsula	1 November 2023	30 April 2024

The Committee noted the Fire Danger Season dates for all Fire Danger Districts.

6.6.2 AFAC Seasonal Outlook

ACO Alison May (SACFS) provided the Committee with a summary of the seasonal outlook for the 2023/2024 summer. The seasonal outlook was released for each State and Territory the morning of 1 December 2023.

The outlook is a collaboration between each State fire service, the Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) and other inputs. It is a national coordination to enable resourcing to occur.

For South Australia, the outlook is as follows:

- A warm spring in the south west of the State
- Dry conditions which will continue in spite of recent rain

- Expectation of above average temperatures
- Forest and shrubland areas are still green but still contain high levels of fine fuel
- Curing rates are increasing
- Soil evaporation and soil dryness will increase with increases in temperature
- Elevated risk of fire, particularly in forest and shrubland areas
- There is increased grass growth in regional areas
- Harvesting has largely been completed, except for in the south east of the state
- Hazard reduction by the Department for Energy and Water (DEW) has been successful

6.6.3 Members' Call

Mr Michael Garrod (LSA) introduced himself to the Committee and then informed the Committee that each region is to receive \$250,000 to prepare for disaster. The money is to be distributed nation-wide. Mr Garrod is seeking further information as there is not much detail about it at this stage, and will provide an update at the next meeting.

Ms Fiona Gill (DEW) introduced herself to the Committee, and noted that DEW had a heavy focus on the spring prescribed burns. The original plan for the burns was ambitious but they had completed 82% of their target to date. More rain had provided opportunity to undertake burns into December, which is unusual. Fifty-six burns had been completed State-wide and 40 of those were in the Adelaide Hills.

AFCO Peter Button (SAMFS) introduced himself to the Committee, and noted that staffing resourcing issues and weather had had impacts, but that recently they had started training for the fire season.

C/Supt John DeCandia (SAPOL) informed the Committee that Operation Nomad had begun and that there are around 80 individuals who require monitoring during Fire Danger Season.

Ms Monique Blason (FSA) introduced herself to the Committee. Ms Blason informed the Committee that the ForestrySA pre-season training has been completed, and their fire crews are ready. ForestrySA have a capital project underway to upgrade to Fire King trucks and have them refurbished and ready for the season ahead.

Ms Kylie Egan (BoM) informed the Committee that they are rolling out the Australian Smoke Dispersal System for tier 2 prescribed burns. It includes all jurisdictions in burning and provides a graphic display of where the smoke is going. It will be a registered user service. Next year the aim is to include fire data, such as where the fire is burning, but more funding is required. There will be more information coming soon.

Ms Karen Lee-Jones (DIT) referred to the BMAP process. They are looking at road, rail, and land assets, as well as fire mitigations on main road corridors in the mid north region.



State Bushfire Coordination Committee

Ms Laura Bruce (PIRSA) noted that PIRSA's bushfire preparation internally and externally is complete.

Ms Sarah Elding (PLUS-DTI) introduced herself to the Committee and noted that they are working on bushfire overlays for bushfire hazard mapping, which, for the first time, will provide modelling for the entire State (not including metropolitan Adelaide).

Ms Monique Blason (FSA) referred back to agenda item 6.6.1 (Fire Danger Season dates), noting she had received some feedback via BMC members regarding the wording of the Fire Season dates briefing note 'based on recommendations': the AMLR BMC did not recommend the Fire Season date for their area be brought forward by two weeks. The SACFS Chief Officer made the decision to bring the dates forward, and the BMC members felt that the phrase was misleading. The AMLR BMC were therefore not comfortable with this wording and wanted to communicate this.

The Chair noted and agreed with this, stating this would be rectified in the future.

6.7 Other Business

No other business was discussed.

6.8 Meeting Close

The Chair thanked everyone for attending the Meeting and declared the Meeting closed at 11:54am.

NEXT MEETING – 23 February 2024

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

Georgie Cornish
A/Chair, State Bushfire Coordination Committee