


Bunbury Water Resource Recovery Facility Ocean Outlet Monitoring Program

Annual Report 2023/2024





Document Management

This report has been prepared by BMT Commercial Australia Ltd Pty for Water Corporation, October 2024, Report Number R-003042-1.

No part of this report should be reproduced, distributed or communicated to any third party unless Water Corporation provides express written consent. Water Corporation does not accept any liability if this report is used for any purpose other than that for which it is intended.

Rev No.	Version description	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Date
A	Technical Review	A Weibel	M Lourey	27/08/2024
B	Client Review	A Weibel	R Munro	19/09/2024
0	Issued for client use	A Weibel	R Munro	25/10/2024
1	Issued for client use	J Robinson	R Munro	31/10/2024

Contact Details

Contact Details			
Name	Ryan Munro	Email	Ryan.Munro@watercorporation.com.au
Position	Technical Advisor – Environment	Postal Address	PO Box 100, Leederville WA 6902
Phone	(08) 9420 3504	Street Address	629 Newcastle Street, Leederville WA



BMT Commercial Australia Pty Ltd has prepared this report in accordance with our Integrated Management System, in compliance with ISO9001, ISO45001 and ISO14001.

Status

This report is 'Draft' until approved for final release, as indicated below by the inclusion of signatures from (i) the author and (ii) a Director of BMT Commercial Australia Pty Ltd (BMT) or their authorised delegate. A Draft report may be issued for review with the intent to generate a 'Final' version, however, must not be used for any other purpose.

Approved for final release:




Director (or delegate)
Date: 31/10/2024



Executive Summary

This report documents the results of 2024 marine environmental monitoring around the Bunbury Ocean outlet. The monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Marine Impacts Monitoring and Management Plan (MIMMP; Water Corporation 2012). The monitoring program aims to determine the physical and chemical properties of the treated wastewater plume and establish its effect on the receiving marine environment. Results are reported in the context of the Environmental Quality Management Framework (EQMF) in accordance with the MIMMP (Water Corporation 2012) or EPA (2017). The results are summarised in Report Card format (Table ES 1). The report card contains colour-coded results, with the individual colours representing the extent to which the Environmental Quality Criteria (EQC) were met (Table ES 2 – Table ES 4).





Table ES 1 Summary report card legend

Management response	Colour code
Monitor: EQG met (continue monitoring)	
Investigate: EQG not met (investigate against the EQS)	
Action: EQS not met (management response required)	






Note:

1. The required response following an exceedance of either the Environmental Quality Guideline (EQG) or Environmental Quality Standard (EQS) is shown in parentheses.

Table ES 2 Summary report card for the Environmental Quality Objective 'Maintenance of Ecosystem Integrity'

Environmental quality indicator		EQC	Comments	Compliance
Toxicants in treated wastewater (TWW)	Bioaccumulating toxicants	EQG	Concentrations of cadmium and mercury in the undiluted TWW stream were below the analytical limit of reporting and ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000) 80% species protection guideline	
	Non-bioaccumulating toxicants and initial dilution	EQG	Total ammonia, copper and zinc concentrations exceeded ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000) guidelines in TWW prior to initial dilution. Initial dilution (of 1:91 expected at the LEPA boundary) was sufficient to reduce contaminant concentrations to below the associated ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000) 99% species protection guidelines.	
	Total toxicity of the mixture (TTM)	EQG	The TTM for the additive effect of ammonia, copper and zinc after initial dilution was 0.38 and below the ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000) guideline value of 1.0	
Nutrient enrichment indicators of increased nutrients	Chlorophyll-a	EQG	Median concentration of chlorophyll-a at compliance sites (0.3 µg/L) exceeded the 80 th percentile of reference site data (0.2 µg/L)	





Environmental quality indicator		EQC	Comments	Compliance
and algal growth potential	Phytoplankton biomass (measured as chlorophyll-a)	EQG	Chlorophyll-a concentration did not exceed 3 times the median of chlorophyll-a concentration of reference site data, on any occasion during summer monitoring	
	Light attenuation coefficient (LAC)	EQG	Median light attenuation measured over the summer period at compliance sites did not exceed the 80 th percentile of historical reference site data.	
	Periphyton chlorophyll-a	EQG	Median concentration of periphyton biomass at compliance sites was above the 80 th percentile of reference site data.	
	Seagrass health	EQS1	Median shoot density fell below the 20 th percentile of reference sites, at site SG4, in two consecutive years (2022 and 2023).	
		EQS2	Median shoot density, at all sites in 2023, was greater than the 5 th percentile of the pooled reference site data. The EQS overall is considered exceeded only if both EQS1 and EQS2 are exceeded. Because EQS2 was met the EQS was met overall.	
Physico-chemical stressor	Dissolved oxygen % saturation	EQG	Dissolved oxygen saturation in bottom waters remained above 90% saturation at all times.	

Notes:

1. Green (■) symbols indicate the Environmental Quality Criteria (EQC) were met; amber (■) and red (■) symbols represent an exceedance of the Environmental Quality Guideline or Environmental Quality Standard (EQS), respectively.
2. WASQAP = Western Australia Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (DoF 2007)

Table ES 3 Summary report card for the Environmental Quality Objective ‘Maintenance of Seafood for Human Consumption’




Environmental quality indicator		EQC	Comments	Compliance
Microbial contaminants	Thermotolerant coliforms (TTC)	EQG	Median TTC concentrations (<10 CFU/100 mL) did not exceed 14 CFU/100 mL and less than 10% of samples exceeded 21 CFU/100 mL	
Algal biotoxins	Toxic phytoplankton species	EQG	No toxic phytoplankton species were recorded in numbers greater than WASQAP trigger values (DoF 2007)	

Notes:

1. Green (■) symbols indicate the Environmental Quality Criteria (EQC) were met; amber (■) and red (■) symbols represent an exceedance of the Environmental Quality Guideline or Environmental Quality Standard (EQS), respectively.
2. WASQAP = Western Australia Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (DoF 2007)



Table ES 4 Summary report card for the Environmental Quality Objective ‘Maintenance of Primary and Secondary Contact Recreation’

Environmental quality indicator		EQC	Comments	Compliance
Faecal pathogens	Enterococci spp.	EQG	Recreational compliance sites had a pooled <i>Enterococci spp.</i> concentrations above 10 MPN/100 mL.	
		EQS	All sites had pooled <i>Enterococci spp.</i> concentrations of 10 MPN/100 mL. Therefore, EQS was met.	
Algal biotoxins	Phytoplankton (cell concentration)	EQG	The toxic algal species of concern (<i>Karenia brevis</i> , <i>Lyngbya majuscula</i> and <i>Pfiesteria spp.</i>) were not recorded	

Notes:

1. Green (■) symbols indicate the Environmental Quality Criteria (EQC) were met; amber (■) and red (■) symbols represent an exceedance of the Environmental Quality Guideline or Environmental Quality Standard (EQS), respectively.



Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Document purpose	2
1.2	Plant infrastructure	2
1.3	Conditions of operation	3
1.4	Environmental Quality Management Framework	3
1.5	BOOM program framework	4
1.5.1	<i>'Maintenance of ecosystem integrity' EQO</i>	5
1.5.2	<i>'Maintenance of aquatic life for human consumption' EQO</i>	6
1.5.3	<i>'Maintenance of primary and secondary contact recreation' EQO</i>	6
2	Waste Stream Monitoring	7
2.1	Monthly Treated Wastewater Characterisation	7
2.2	Comprehensive treated wastewater characterisation	9
2.2.1	<i>Initial dilution monitoring</i>	9
2.2.2	<i>Initial dilution using model simulation</i>	9
2.2.3	<i>Initial dilution using the nutrient concentrations</i>	10
2.2.4	<i>Bioaccumulating toxicants</i>	10
2.2.5	<i>Non-bioaccumulating toxicants</i>	11
2.2.6	<i>Total toxicity of the mixture</i>	12
3	Water Quality Monitoring – Receiving Environment.....	13
3.1	Nutrient enrichment	14
3.1.1	<i>Surface water chlorophyll-a</i>	14
3.1.2	<i>Phytoplankton biomass</i>	15
3.1.3	<i>Light attenuation coefficient</i>	15
3.1.4	<i>Periphyton biomass</i>	16
3.1.5	<i>Seagrass health</i>	18
3.2	Physico-chemical stressor	19
3.2.1	<i>Dissolved oxygen</i>	19
4	Seafood Safe for Human Consumption.....	21
4.1	Sampling approach and site locations	21
4.2	Thermotolerant coliforms sampling	22
4.3	Thermotolerant coliforms results	22
4.4	Algal biotoxins sampling	23
4.5	Algal biotoxins results	24
5	Primary and secondary contact recreation.....	28
5.1	Sampling approach and site locations	28
5.2	Faecal pathogens sampling	29
5.3	Faecal pathogen results	29
5.4	Algal biotoxins sampling	31
5.5	Algal biotoxins results	31
6	References.....	33
	Appendix 1 – Initial Dilution Modelling.....	34
	Appendix 2 – Detailed Methods	35
	Appendix 3 – Nutrients Results	36
	Appendix 4 – Phytoplankton Results	37
	Appendix 5 – Microbiology Results.....	38



1 Introduction

1.1 Document purpose

Water Corporation is required to ensure that the discharge of treated wastewater (TWW) from the Bunbury Water Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF) to the marine environment is environmentally sustainable and managed appropriately for the protection of ecosystem and social values. To meet this outcome, Water Corporation undertake their operations in accordance with environmental commitments and Licence Conditions that are outlined in Ministerial Statement (MS) 572. The Bunbury Operations Environmental Management program and the Marine Impacts Monitoring and Management Plan (MIMMP; Water Corporation 2012) for the Bunbury Ocean Outlet were designed according to Schedule 2 (Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments) of MS 572.

This report describes the results and outcomes of the 2023-2024 Bunbury Ocean Outlet Monitoring (BOOM) program carried out in accordance with the methods and criteria in Water Corporation (2012). The program aims to determine the chemical and physical properties of the TWW plume and to determine the potential effects of TWW discharge on the receiving marine environment.

1.2 Plant infrastructure

The Bunbury WRRF primarily services the City of Bunbury. Ocean disposal of TWW from the Bunbury WRRF commenced in July 2002. Prior to disposal, the wastewater is treated using microbial processes to reduce concentrations of nitrogen via an intermittently decanting extended aeration plant. These processes produce secondary TWW and biosolids.

The ocean outlet is located approximately 7 km south of the Bunbury Central Business District, south-west Western Australia (Figure 1.1). TWW is discharged via a sub-sea diffuser, located 1.7 km perpendicular to the shoreline (Water Corporation 2012). The diffuser comprises a series of ports that are designed to maximise dispersion and dilution of the TWW with the natural seawater. TWW is freshwater and less dense than seawater. After discharge via the ports, the buoyant TWW plume rises through the water column and continues to mix as it ascends.



Figure 1.1 Location of the Bunbury Water Resource Recovery Facility and ocean outlet.

1.3 Conditions of operation

The Bunbury WRRF operates in accordance with Conditions outlined in MS 572. Conditions 6.1 and 6.2 of MS 572 include a requirement to ensure the ecological and social health objectives are met in their respective management areas.

1.4 Environmental Quality Management Framework

Monitoring was completed according to Western Australia's Environmental Quality Management Framework (EQMF; EPA 2016). The EQMF is based on:

- identifying Environmental Values (EVs) (Figure 1.2)
- establishing and spatially defining Environmental Quality Objectives (EQOs) that need to be maintained to ensure the associated EVs are protected (Figure 1.2)
- monitoring and managing to ensure the EQOs are achieved and/or maintained in the long-term in the areas they have been designated
- establishing Environmental Quality Criteria (EQC) which are quantitative benchmarks or 'trigger values' against which monitoring results can be compared.

There are two levels of EQC:

1. Environmental Quality Guidelines (EQGs) are quantitative, investigative triggers which, if met, indicate there is a high degree of certainty the associated EQO has been achieved. If the guideline is not met a more detailed assessment against the EQS is triggered.



2. Environmental Quality Standards (EQSs) are management triggers which, if exceeded, signify the EQO is at risk of not being met and that a management response may be required.




Figure 1.2 Establishing Values and Environmental Quality Objectives (EQO) for the marine waters of Western Australia

1.5 BOOM program framework

MS 572 requires that the EVs Ecosystem Health and Recreation and Aesthetics are maintained and the associated EQOs (EQO1, EQO3, EQO4 and EQO5; Figure 1.2) are met within 100 m of the Bunbury ocean outlet (Figure 1.3). MS 572 requires that the EV Fishing and Aquaculture is maintained and the associated EQOs (EQO2 Figure 1.2) are met within 500 m of the Bunbury ocean outlet (Figure 1.3).




Figure 1.3 Environmental management areas as defined in Schedule 1 of Ministerial Statement 572

1.5.1 ‘Maintenance of ecosystem integrity’ EQO

The intent of this EQO is to maintain a healthy and diverse ecosystem. The EQO applies a designated level of ecological protection: low, moderate, high, or maximum (Figure 1.4). A low level of ecological protection applies in the low ecological protection area (LEPA) occupying the area within a 100 m radius of the diffuser at the Bunbury outfall. Waters outside the LEPA are designated as a high ecological protection area (HEPA) and maintained to a high level of ecological protection.

The extent to which the EQO for the Maintenance of Ecosystem Integrity was met during the 2023–2024 reporting period is assessed against the EQC for waste stream characterisation (i.e. toxicants in TWW) and the EQC for receiving waters (i.e. water quality and seagrass health).




Figure 1.4 Level of ecological protection

1.5.2 'Maintenance of aquatic life for human consumption' EQO

The intent of this EQO is to maintain aquatic life safe for human consumption (a social value) except for a small area surrounding the ocean outlet within 500 m of the diffuser (S2; Figure 1.3), where shellfish may be unsafe to eat.

1.5.3 'Maintenance of primary and secondary contact recreation' EQO

Primary contact recreation will be maintained outside 100 m of the diffuser (S3; Figure 1.3). Secondary contact recreation is not to be affected by the presence of the Bunbury ocean outlet. As the EQO for maintenance of primary contact recreation uses a higher water quality standard than secondary contact recreation, it is assumed that if the primary contact criteria are met, then the secondary contact criteria are also met by default.



2 Waste Stream Monitoring

Monitoring of TWW prior to discharge consisted of:

- monthly TWW characterisation
- annual comprehensive TWW characterisation
- initial dilution monitoring.

2.1 Monthly Treated Wastewater Characterisation

TWW from Pond 2 Discharge Weir was sampled on the second Tuesday of each month by Water Corporation and analysed for:

- total ammonium
- filtered biochemical oxygen demand (BOD)
- conductivity at 25°C
- total nitrogen (TN)
- total phosphorus (TP)
- nitrate and nitrite (NO_x)
- Escherichia coli (E. coli).

This regulatory monthly sampling is carried out in accordance with Bunbury No. 2 WRRF operating licence L5972/1922/14. The operating licence limit for total phosphorus of 10 mg/L was met during the July 2023–June 2024 reporting period (Table 2.1). All other discharge limits in the Schedule 1 Table of MS 572 (suspended solids, biochemical oxygen demand, total nitrogen and total nitrogen load) are reported separately.



Table 2.1 Regulatory monthly parameter results from Pond 2 Discharge Weir

Month	Total ammonium	Filtered BOD	Conductivity Laboratory at 25 °C	E. coli	NOx	TN	TP
Unit	mg/L	mg/L	S/cm	Cells/100mL	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L
LoR	NA	<5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jul 23	1.8	<5	99	13000	1.1	4.5	3.6
Aug 23	3.8	<5	99	>24000	0.89	6.6	3.2
Sep 23	3.6	<5	98	10000	0.91	6.8	2.9
Oct 23	2.5	<5	96	>24000	2.4	6.9	3.0
Nov 23	3.7	<5	97	24000	3.6	10	2.3
Dec 23	2.8	<5	99	>24000	1.9	7.5	2.5
Jan 24	3.5	<5	116	>24000	0.99	6.2	1.8
Feb 24	4.2	<5	114	20000	1.3	8.2	2.0
Mar 24	3.8	<5	102	>24000	1.4	6.8	3.3
Apr 24	1.9	<5	104	11000	2.6	6.4	2.9
May 24	5.0	<5	109	9800	1.1	8.4	3.3
Jun 24	5.4	<5	105	>24000	1.3	9.0	2.6
Mean	3.5	<5	103	14633	1.6	7.3	2.8

Note:

1. LoR = Limit of reporting, BOD = biological oxygen demand, TN = total nitrogen, TP = total phosphorus, NOx = nitrate+nitrite, *E. coli* = *Escherichia coli*, NA = not applicable.



2.2 Comprehensive treated wastewater characterisation

TWW (final effluent) from the Bunbury WRRF was analysed for a suite of potential contaminants of concern:

- ammonium as nitrogen
- NO_x as nitrogen
- TP
- TSS
- BOD (5–day)
- salinity
- metals (Ag, As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Hg, Mo, Ni, Pb, Se, Zn)
- pesticides
- herbicides

2.2.1 Initial dilution monitoring

The MIMMP requires the initial dilution of TWW to be estimated using two different methods (i) using an internationally recognised mixing model (in this case VPLUMES) simulation of the conditions at the time of sampling and (ii) using the concentrations of nutrients within TWW compared to the in-water estimates at the times of sampling (Water Corporation 2012). The most conservative (lowest) estimate of the two is used in further calculations and comparisons (Water Corporation 2012).

2.2.2 Initial dilution using model simulation

Initial dilution modelling (using plume dispersion model VPLUMES) was used to predict the near field dilution of the wastewater plume around the Bunbury ocean outlet. Initial dilution is the dilution between the point of discharge and the point of maximum rise or fall of the plume (in this case when the buoyant plume reaches the surface).

On 10 January 2024 (concurrent to the first summer water quality survey), the flow rate into Bunbury WRRF was 11.15 ML. To determine the current velocity and direction at the time of sampling, a surface drogue was released above the outlet diffuser and the location of the drogue recorded at intervals over time using an on-board Global Positioning System. Surface current velocities were used to synthesise a vertical velocity profile based on the gradient determined by current meters deployed at 2 m and 7.5 m above the seabed ~900 m offshore from the diffuser at the Bunbury ocean outlet (WNI 2000).

Modelling using VPLUMES indicated an average initial dilution of 1:316 and a centreline dilution of 1:172 on 10 January 2024 (Figure 2.1). The full model output is included in Appendix 1.




Figure 2.1 Initial dilution modelling output showing predicted plume elevation trajectory (left) and predicted average and centreline dilutions (right)

2.2.3 Initial dilution using the nutrient concentrations

The lowest dilution expected to occur at the Bunbury outlet based on measurement of in-water nutrient concentrations was 1:91 for nitrate+nitrite (Table 2.2). The most conservative estimate of initial dilution was the average initial dilution modelled via nutrient concentrations, which was 1:91 and it will be used in calculations for non-bioaccumulating toxicants and total toxicity of the mixture (Section 2.2.5 and Section 2.2.6).

Table 2.2 Minimum initial dilution achieved for total ammonia, nitrate+nitrite and total phosphorus

Parameter	Undiluted TWW concentration (µg/L)	Surface maximum ¹ (µg/L)	Surface background ² (µg/L)	Minimal initial dilution achieved ³
Total ammonia	3000	12	1.5	286
Nitrate+nitrite	1000	15	4	91
Total phosphorus	2000	13	1	167

Notes:

1. Highest surface concentration recorded at the nutrient dilution sites.
2. Average surface concentration of five reference sites (WQR1-WQR5); where this value was <LoR, the LoR was used to calculate the average surface concentration.
3. Minimum initial dilution = treated wastewater (TWW) concentration/surface maximum – surface background.
4. N/A = not applicable because surface maximum concentration equals surface background concentration.

2.2.4 Bioaccumulating toxicants

The EQG for bioaccumulating toxicants (cadmium and mercury) in the TWW is outlined in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3 Environmental Quality Guideline (EQG) for bioaccumulating toxicants

EQG	Concentrations of contaminants will not exceed the ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000) 80% species protection guideline trigger levels for bioaccumulating toxicants in wastewater stream before dilution
-----	---

Source: Water Corporation (2012)

Notes:

1. EQG = Environmental quality guideline

Concentrations of cadmium and mercury (i.e. bioaccumulating toxicants) in the TWW sample before dilution were both below their analytical limit of reporting (and the ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000) 80% species protection guideline trigger levels) and the EQG for bioaccumulating toxicants was met (Table 2.4).



2.2.5 Non-bioaccumulating toxicants

With the exception of ammonia and zinc, non-bioaccumulating toxicant concentrations were below the ANZECC/ARMCANZ 99% species protection guidelines prior to discharge and initial dilution with seawater (Table 2.4). After an initial dilution of 1:91 (a conservative estimate of the dilution expected at the LEPA boundary), contaminant concentrations of ammonia, copper and zinc were below ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000) 99% species protection guidelines (Table 2.4) and the EQG for non-bioaccumulating toxicants was met.

Table 2.4 Toxicants in the Bunbury TWW compared with relevant guideline trigger levels after initial dilution

Toxicant	Bunbury TWW concentration (µg/L)	Concentration after initial dilution (µg/L) ¹	Trigger (µg/L) ²
Ammonia-N	3000	34.47	500
Nitrate+Nitrite	1000	-	ID
Total phosphorus	2000	-	n/a
Total suspended solids	5000		<10 ³
Arsenic	<20	-	n/a
Cadmium	<0.6	-	36
Chromium	<1	-	0.14 (Cr VI)
Copper	<1		0.3
Lead	<10	-	2.2
Mercury	<0.1	-	1.4
Nickel	<7	-	7
Selenium	<20	-	n/1
Silver	<10	-	0.8
Zinc	47	0.67	7
Molybdenum	<4	-	ID
Salinity (psu)	0.5	-	n/a
BOD (mg/L)	<5	-	n/a
Chloropyrifos	<0.1	-	0.0005
Endrin	<0.01	-	0.004
Endosulfan sulfate	<0.01	-	0.005

Notes:

1. Concentration after initial dilution and natural surface background. Initial dilution = 1:91. Natural surface background ammonia 1.5 µg/L; copper 0.08 µg/L and zinc 0.15 µg/L (Table 2.6). Contaminant dilution calculations were not performed (–) on any toxicants where concentrations were below the analytical limit of reporting or where the 99% species protection guideline value was not the trigger (i.e. cadmium, mercury and total suspended solids).
2. Assessment against ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000) 99% species protection guidelines for non-bioaccumulating toxicants; guideline values for marine waters.
3. Guideline value for the protection of aquaculture species in saltwater production (ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000)).
4. The bioaccumulating toxicants cadmium and mercury must meet the 80% species protection guidelines at the diffuser (i.e. prior to initial dilution), and therefore a diluted concentration was not calculated.
5. ID = insufficient data to derive a reliable national trigger value.
6. Bold text represents an exceedance of guideline values prior to initial dilution.



2.2.6 Total toxicity of the mixture

The potential for additive toxic effects of TWW on marine organisms at the edge of the initial mixing zone (i.e. after initial dilution of the TWW with seawater) was assessed as per the ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000) calculation for the total toxicity of the mixture (TTM). TTM is a relative score and does not have a unit of measurement. The EQG for the TTM is outlined in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5 Environmental Quality Guideline for the Total Toxicity of the Mixture (TTM)

EQG	Where there are mixtures of toxicants, the TTM at a single site or for a defined area, should not exceed 1, using the TTM formula.
-----	--

Notes:

1. EQG = Environmental quality guideline; TTM = total toxicity of the mixture
2. $TTM = \sum (C_i/EQGi)$ where C_i is the concentration of the 'i'th component in the mixture and the $EQGi$ is the guideline for that component.

The TTM following minimum initial dilution of 1:91 was 0.45 (Table 2.6) and was below the ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000) guideline, meeting the EQG. As such, it is not expected that the combined additive effect of these contaminants will have an adverse effect in the area surrounding the Bunbury ocean outlet.

Table 2.6 Total toxicity of treated wastewater (TWW) at the edge of the initial mixing zone associated with the Bunbury ocean outlet

Natural concentrations in Perth's coastal waters			Initial dilution of TWW with seawater	Total toxicity of the mixture (TTM)
Ammonia (µg/L)	Copper (µg/L)	Zinc (µg/L)		
1.5	0.08	0.15	1:91	0.45

Notes:

1. Background concentrations for copper and zinc from McAlpine et al. (2005); Perth marine waters (99. 19; Table 12). Surface background concentration for ammonia calculated as the average surface concentration of the five reference sites (WQR1-WQR5); where this value was less than the limit of reporting (LoR), half the LoR was used in calculations.
2. $TTM = [ammonia]/guideline + [copper]/guideline + [zinc]/guideline$.



3 Water Quality Monitoring – Receiving Environment

Water Corporation (2012) requires the assessment of indicators of nutrient enrichment and physico-chemical stress in receiving waters. Indicators for nutrient enrichment that were measured in receiving waters to assess marine water quality are:

- surface chlorophyll-*a*
- phytoplankton biomass
- light attenuation coefficient (LAC)
- periphyton
- seagrass shoot density

Dissolved oxygen (DO) was also measured and is the indicator for physico-chemical stress due to increased organic matter load.

Sampling procedures were followed at compliance monitoring, plume tracking, periphyton monitoring and seagrass health sites over the summer monitoring period (Appendix 2). Nutrients, phytoplankton biomass, light attenuation and the physico-chemical stressor DO were monitored during three separate surveys on 16 January, 6 February and 6 March 2024, along a down-current gradient away from the diffuser (Appendix 2). Periphyton was monitored using collector plates deployed from 11 January 2024 to 08 February 2024 (Appendix 2). Seagrass health was monitored as shoot density on 11 and 12 January 2024.

Nutrient concentrations (ammonia, ortho-phosphate, nitrate+nitrite) in receiving waters were measured down current from the outlet, for contextual purposes only (to identify nutrient gradients) (see Appendix 3 for results).



3.1 Nutrient enrichment

3.1.1 Surface water chlorophyll-a

The EQG for surface water chlorophyll-a is outlined in Table 3.1.


Table 3.1 Environmental Quality Guideline for surface water chlorophyll-a

EQG	The median surface chlorophyll-a concentration at the boundary of the LEPA is not to exceed the 80 th percentile of historical reference site data.
-----	--

Notes:

1. EQG = Environmental quality guideline; LEPA = low ecological protection area.

Chlorophyll-a in surface waters ranged from 0.2 µg/L to 0.4 µg/L across all sites (Figure 3.1). The median chlorophyll-a concentration in surface waters for compliance monitoring sites was 0.3 µg/L. This was above the 80th percentile of historical reference site data (0.2 µg/L from 2003–2023: yellow dashed line in Figure 3.1), exceeding the EQG for surface water chlorophyll-a.



Notes:

1. Water quality monitoring occurred at compliance sites C5–C9 on 10 January, C11–C15 on 06 February and C13–C16, C1 on 06 March 2024, as a result of prevailing currents at the time of sampling.
2. Dark grey bars indicate sites relevant to the Environmental Quality Guideline (EQG) for chlorophyll-a.
3. Yellow dashed line represents the 80th percentile of historical reference site data which is the Environmental Quality Guideline (0.2 µg/L) for surface chlorophyll-a.
4. Red dashed line represents the median in surface for compliance sites relevant to the Environmental Quality Guideline (EQG) for chlorophyll-a.

Figure 3.1 Surface chlorophyll-a concentrations at compliance and reference sites in 2024 around Bunbury ocean outlet



3.1.2 Phytoplankton biomass

The EQG for phytoplankton biomass (also measured as concentration of chlorophyll-a) is outlined in Table 3.2.


Table 3.2 Environmental Quality Guideline for phytoplankton biomass

EQG	Phytoplankton biomass (measured as chlorophyll-a concentration) does not exceed three times the median of chlorophyll-a concentrations of historical reference site data, on any occasion, during the non-river flow period.
------------	--

Notes:

1. EQG = Environmental quality guideline

Phytoplankton biomass (measured as chlorophyll-a) ranged from 0.2 to 0.4 µg/L in surface waters across all compliance sites. Phytoplankton biomass did not exceed three times the median of historical reference site data (0.6 µg/L from 2003-2024: yellow dashed line in Figure 3.2) on any occasion during the non-river flow period, meeting the EQG.



Notes:

1. Water quality monitoring occurred at compliance sites C05–C09 on 10 January, C11–C15 on 06 February and C13–C16, C1 on 06 March 2024, as a result of prevailing currents at the time of sampling.
2. Dark grey bars indicate sites relevant to the Environmental Quality Guideline (EQG) for phytoplankton biomass.
3. Yellow dashed line represents 3 times the median chlorophyll-a concentration of historical reference site data which is the Environmental Quality Guideline (0.6 µg/L) for phytoplankton biomass.

Figure 3.2 Phytoplankton biomass at compliance and reference sites in 2024 around Bunbury ocean outlet

3.1.3 Light attenuation coefficient

The EQG relevant to the LAC is outlined in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 Environmental Quality Guideline for light attenuation


EQG	The median LAC, during the summer period, is not to exceed 80th percentile of historical reference site data.
------------	---

Notes:

1. EQG = Environmental quality guideline; LAC = light attenuation coefficient



Median LAC measured over summer 2024 at compliance sites (0.0658 Log10/m) did not exceed the 80th percentile of historical reference site data (0.0851 Log10/m from 2013-2024 yellow dashed line in Figure 3.3), meeting the EQG for this indicator (Figure 3.3).



Notes:

1. Water quality monitoring occurred at compliance sites C7–C11 on 10 January, C1–C5 on 06 February and C7–C11 on 06 March 2024, as a result of prevailing currents at the time of sampling.
2. Dark grey bars indicate sites relevant to the Environmental Quality Guideline (EQG) for light attenuation, median of which is 0.0658 Log10/m.
3. Yellow dashed line is 80th percentile of historical reference site data which is the Environmental Quality Guideline (0.0851 Log10/m).

Figure 3.3 Light attenuation coefficient measured at compliance and reference sites in 2024

3.1.4 Periphyton biomass

Periphyton collectors provide a time-integrated measure of attached algal growth (epiphytes). Increased periphyton biomass on artificial substrata (measured as chlorophyll-a, -b and -c) in response to nutrient enrichment has been confirmed as an indicator of enhanced productivity resulting from wastewater discharge in Perth's coastal waters (Cosgrove et al. 2004). The EQG for periphyton biomass is in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Environmental Quality Guideline for periphyton biomass

EQG	Median periphyton biomass (measured as chlorophyll a) from compliance sites is not to exceed the 80 th percentile of reference site data from the same sampling period at 8 m depth.
------------	---


Notes:

1. EQG = Environmental quality guideline; LEPA = low ecological protection area.



The median chlorophyll-*a* concentration from the 8 m depth was 11.5 mg/m² and was above the 80th percentile of reference site data from the same 2024 sampling period at the 8 m depth (9.63 mg/m²; Figure 3.4). One sample was lost (PP4), and only three sites were used for analysis. The EQG was not met and further assessment against the EQS (seagrass health) was triggered.

Of the three chlorophyll types (chlorophyll-*a*, -*b* and -*c*) measured on periphyton collector plates, chlorophyll-*a* was present in the highest biomass, followed by chlorophyll-*c* and then chlorophyll-*b* (Figure 3.4). The dominant chlorophyll-*a* content is indicative of a periphyton assemblage dominated by diatoms and/or brown algae (SKM 1999).



Notes:


1. Bars=mean (\pm standard error) chlorophyll-*a*, -*b* and -*c* concentration at compliance sites (PP1-PP3) and reference sites (PPR1 and PPR2).
2. Red dashed line = median of chlorophyll-*a* concentration across compliance sites (11.5 mg/m² where n=6).
3. Yellow dashed line = 80th percentile of chlorophyll-*a* concentration at reference sites (9.63 mg/m² where n=4).

Figure 3.4 Periphyton chlorophyll-*a*, -*b*, and -*c* content at compliance and reference sites at 8m depth.

Periphyton samples were analysed for nitrogen isotopic composition, to determine if the periphyton growth patterns can be attributed to nutrient-rich wastewater around the Bunbury ocean outlet.



Mean $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ was higher in surface samples at all compliance sites PP2 and PP3, than surface samples from the two reference sites (PPR1 and PPR2) and compliance site PP1 (Figure 3.5). At each site, mean $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of periphyton was higher in the surface samples than the bottom samples (Figure 3.5). The bottom mean $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ was similar between the compliance and reference site samples (Figure 3.5). The high mean periphyton $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ at the surface but not in bottom samples (Figure 3.5) suggests that the influence of the buoyant TWW plume is restricted to the surface and cannot account for the elevated chlorophyll-a content in periphyton from 8 m water depths (Figure 3.4).



Notes:

1. PP1-PP4 = periphyton compliance sites; PPR1 and PPR2 = periphyton reference sites.
2. At each site and each depth there was sufficient epiphyte growth on the collector plates for 2 replicates.
3. Error bars represent \pm standard error.

Figure 3.5 Mean $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ content in periphyton collected at compliance and reference sites

3.1.5 Seagrass health

The EQG for periphyton biomass was exceeded during the 2024 monitoring and assessment against the EQS (seagrass health) was required. The EQS for seagrass health are outlined in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5 Environmental Quality Standards for seagrass health

EQS1	Median seagrass meadow shoot density measured during January and in two consecutive years is greater than the 20 th percentile of shoot density measured at an appropriate reference site.
	And
EQS2	Median seagrass meadow shoot density in any one year is greater than the 5 th percentile of meadow shoot density measured at an appropriate reference site.


Notes:

1. EQS = Environmental quality standard..
2. The EPA derived these EQS for seagrass shoot density specifically relevant for assessing the health of species of Posidonia (EPA 2005).



EQS1 is exceeded if median shoot density measured over two consecutive years falls below the 20th percentile at an appropriate reference site (red dashed line; Figure 3.6). Median shoot density, at site SG4, was below the 20th percentile of reference sites (red dashed line; Figure 3.6) in 2023 but not in 2024 and EQS1 was met. In 2023, median shoot density at site SG4 (453 shoots/m²) was only below the EQS1 (490 shoots/m²) by 37 shoots/m², while the standard error was 69 shoots/m². This suggests that seagrass health is not compromised and the small sample size could be creating an artifact.

In 2024, at all sites, the median shoot density was greater than the 5th percentile of the pooled reference site data (red solid line; Figure 3.6), meeting EQS2. The EQS was met overall.



Notes

1. SG1–SG4 = seagrass compliance sites and SG4d = seagrass reference site

Figure 3.6 Median seagrass shoot density at seagrass health monitoring sites

3.2 Physico-chemical stressor

3.2.1 Dissolved oxygen

The EQG for dissolved oxygen (DO) is outlined in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6 Environmental Quality Guideline for dissolved oxygen


EQG	Ambient dissolved oxygen in bottom waters (0-0.5 m above the sediment surface) is greater than 90% saturation at any site for a defined period of not more than six weeks.
-----	--

Notes:

1. EQG = Environmental quality guideline



The EQG for dissolved oxygen (DO) in the bottom remained above 90% saturation at all compliance monitoring sites, at all times, meeting the EQG (Figure 3.7).



Notes:

1. Water quality monitoring occurred at compliance sites C7–C11 on 10 January, C1–C5 on 06 February and at C7–C11 on 06 March 2024, as a result of prevailing currents at the time of sampling.
2. Dark grey bars indicate sites relevant to the Environmental Quality Guideline for dissolved oxygen (DO).
3. Yellow dashed lines is the EQG for DO (90% saturation).
4. DO was measured from the seabed to 0.5 m above seabed.


Figure 3.7 Dissolved oxygen in bottom waters at compliance and reference site



4 Seafood Safe for Human Consumption

4.1 Sampling approach and site locations

The EQO for the EV 'Fishing and Aquaculture' is aimed at ensuring that seafood is safe for human consumption. To ensure the EQO is met, thermotolerant coliforms (TTC) and algal biotoxins are monitored. The social health EQO of 'Seafood Safe for Human Consumption' must be met at the boundary of the Shellfish Harvesting Exclusion Zone (SHEZ, or S2 area), represented by a concentric ring 500 m from the diffuser (Figure 4.1). Shellfish compliance monitoring sites (C17–C32) are positioned at the boundary of the SHEZ, but only the five compliance sites directly down-current of the outlet are sampled during each monitoring period (January, February and March).



Notes:

1. Water quality monitoring occurred at compliance sites C23–C27 on 10 January, C17–C21 on 6 February and at C23–C27 on 6 March 2024, as a result of prevailing currents at the time of sampling.

Figure 4.1 Aquatic life for human consumption compliance (C17–C32) and reference (WQR1–WQR5b) monitoring sites

The EQO, Maintenance of Seafood Safe for Human Consumption, is primarily concerned with the harvesting and consumption of raw shellfish (meaning filter-feeding bivalve molluscs including oysters, mussels, pipis, scallops, cockles and razor clams), and not other forms of seafood. The Department of Health (DoH) discourages the public from taking wild shellfish recommending that instead shellfish are only consumed if grown commercially under strict monitoring programs. There is no aquaculture within 250 m of the diffuser, and there are no licensed shellfish growing areas located in the Bunbury region (DoH 2015). The DoH has further indicated that "it is impossible to guarantee the safety of eating wild shellfish without having a comprehensive monitoring program that tests the waterway concerned for harmful microorganisms and toxins" (EPA 2005) and has formally advised the Department of Environment Regulation (DER) that, in the absence



of a full monitoring program, the application of the TTC criteria (EPA 2005) is insufficient to protect those who wish to collect and eat wild shellfish.

4.2 Thermotolerant coliforms sampling

Many disease-causing organisms are transferred from human and animal faeces to water via TWW and can then be ingested by marine fauna, adversely affecting the suitability of such fauna for human consumption. Thermotolerant coliforms (TTCs) are bacteria that primarily originate in the intestines of warm-blooded animals. By analysing for TTC, it can be determined whether the ocean water around the Bunbury ocean outlet has been exposed to faecal contamination.

Water samples were collected from the surface and bottom of the water column for TTC analyses at compliance monitoring sites, shoreline monitoring sites, plume tracking sites and reference sites over the three sampling dates 10 January, 6 February and 6 March 2024. Samples were collected in pre-sterilised bottles before being chilled to 4°C and placed in the dark. On completion of sampling, the samples were transferred to the PathWest Laboratory and analysed to NATA-accredited methods.

4.3 Thermotolerant coliforms results

The EQG for microbial contaminants for the protection of aquatic life for human consumption is outlined in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Environmental Quality Guideline for thermotolerant coliforms

EQG	Median TTC concentrations across compliance sites are not to exceed 14 CFU/100 mL and that no more than 10% of samples are to exceed 21 CFU/100 mL
-----	--

Notes:

1. EQG = Environmental quality guideline; CFU = colony forming unit



Concentrations of TTC in both surface and bottom waters and at all compliance monitoring sites were below the analytical limit of detection (<10 CFU/100 mL; Table 4.2). Median concentrations of TTC were below 14 CFU/100 mL and less than 10% of samples exceeded 21 CFU/100 mL (Table 4.2), meeting the EQG (Table 4.1).

Table 4.2 Confirmed thermotolerant coliform concentrations downstream of the Bunbury treated wastewater ocean outlet

Date	Compliance site	TTC in surface water (CFU/100 mL)	TTC in bottom waters (CFU/100 mL)
10 January 2024	C23	<10	<10
	C24	<10	<10
	C25	<10	<10
	C26	<10	<10
	C27	<10	<10
06 February 2024	C17	<10	<10
	C18	<10	<10
	C19	<10	<10
	C20	<10	<10
	C21	<10	<10
06 March 2024	C23	<10	<10
	C24	<10	<10
	C25	<10	<10
	C26	<10	<10
	C27	<10	<10

Notes:

1. Water quality samples for microbiological contaminants were sampled ~1 m below the surface of the water and 2 m above the seabed (Water Corporation 2012).
2. TTC = thermotolerant coliforms.

4.4 Algal biotoxins sampling

Nutrient enrichment (as a result of the TWW discharge) can induce shifts in the naturally occurring planktonic algae community to more harmful species. Water Corporation (2012) includes a requirement to monitor for potentially toxic phytoplankton species (as per DoF 2007) in the area surrounding Bunbury ocean outlet. Although most algal blooms are non-toxic, some may contain species that produce toxins and/or have a potentially harmful effect on the surrounding marine environment.

Water samples were collected from the surface and bottom of the water column at compliance monitoring sites and reference sites (outlined in Figure 4.1), at the SHEZ boundary, 500 m from the diffuser, and analysed for toxic species of phytoplankton (defined by Western Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (WASQAP) guidelines; DoF 2007). Phytoplankton samples were preserved in Lugol's iodine solution and identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible. The phytoplankton results are presented in Appendix 4.



4.5 Algal biotoxins results

The EQG for toxic phytoplankton species (Table 4.3) states that concentrations of potentially toxic algae are not to exceed the WASQAP trigger concentrations in any samples (DoF 2007). Table 4.4 lists the phytoplankton species known to produce toxins that may be concentrated in shellfish and their WASQAP (DoF 2007) guideline trigger concentrations.

Table 4.3 Environmental Quality Guideline for toxic phytoplankton species

	Phytoplankton specie	Concentration of potentially toxic algae at the boundary of the SHEZ are not exceed the WASQAP ¹ trigger concentrations in any sample
EQG	<i>Alexandrium</i> spp.	100 cells/L
	<i>Gymnodinium catenatum</i>	1,000 cells/L
	<i>Karenia</i> spp.	1,000 cells/L
	<i>Dinophysis</i> spp.	500 cells/L
	<i>Dinophysis acuminata</i>	3,000 cells/L
	<i>Prorocentrum lima</i>	500 cells/L
	<i>Pseudo-nitzschia</i> spp.	250,000 cells/L
	<i>Gonyaulax cf. spinifera</i>	100 cells/L
	<i>Protoceratium reticulatum</i>	50,000 cells/L

Notes:

1. Western Australian Shellfish Assurance Program (WASQAP; DoF 2007) as stipulated by Water Corporation 2012.

The phytoplankton species of *Gymnodinium* spp. had estimated cell density greater than the WASQAP (DoF 2007) at the site C21 bottom on the 6 February (1,120 cells/L) and site C25 bottom on the 8 January 2024 (1,280 cells/L; Table 4.4). Additionally, the phytoplankton *Gonyaulax* spp. exceeded WASQP (DoF 2007) trigger concentration at 160 cells/L at the site C21 surface during 8 February 2024 (Table 4.4). However, the laboratory did not ID these phytoplankton to species and it is unknown what proportion of the *Gymnodinium* spp, and *Gonyaulax* spp. recorded are the species to which the triggers apply (*Gymnodinium catenatum* and *Gonyaulax cf. spinifera*). It is most likely that the specific phytoplankton present did not exceed the WASQAP (DoF 2007) trigger concentrations. All other samples had no phytoplankton species present at densities greater than WASQAP (DoF 2007) guideline concentrations (Table 4.4)



Table 4.4 Estimated cell density of phytoplankton species known to produce toxins that may be concentrated in shellfish downstream of the Bunbury treated wastewater ocean outlet

Date	Site	Depth	Species	Estimated cell density (cells/L)	WASQAP ¹ (cells/L)	Compliance
10 January 2024	C23	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	160	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	80	250,000	■
	C24	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	80	1,000	■
	C25	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	80	1,000	■
	C26	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	640	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	160	250,000	■
	C27	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	560	1,000	■
	C23	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	560	1,000	■
			<i>Karenia papilionaceae</i>	80	1,000	■
	C24	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	480	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	80	250,000	■
	C25	Bottom	<i>Gonyaulax spp.</i>	80	100	■
			<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	1,280	1,000	■
	C26	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	480	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	80	250,000	■
	C27	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	800	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	160	250,000	■
06 February 2024	C17	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	160	1,000	■
			<i>Prorocentrum lima</i>	160	500	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	80	250,000	■
	C18	Surface	<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	720	250,000	■
	C19	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	80	1,000	■



Date	Site	Depth	Species	Estimated cell density (cells/L)	WASQAP ¹ (cells/L)	Compliance
			<i>Prorocentrum lima</i>	80	500	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	560	250,000	■
	C20	Surface	<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	640	250,000	■
	C21	Surface	<i>Gonyaulax spp.</i>	160	100	■
			<i>Gymnodinium spp.</i>	80	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	480	250,000	■
	C17	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	160	1,000	■
			<i>Prorocentrum lima</i>	160	500	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	160	250,000	■
	C18	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	480	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	720	250,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "seriata" group</i>	80	250,000	■
	C19	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	240	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	160	250,000	■
	C20	Bottom	<i>Alexandrium spp.</i>	80	100	■
			<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	80	1,000	■
			<i>Prorocentrum lima</i>	80	500	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	240	250,000	■
	C21	Bottom	<i>Gonyaulax spp.</i>	80	100	■
			<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	1,120	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	640	250,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "seriata" group</i>	80	250,000	■
06 March 2024	C23	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	80	1,000	■



Date	Site	Depth	Species	Estimated cell density (cells/L)	WASQAP ¹ (cells/L)	Compliance
	C24	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	560	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	320	250,000	■
	C25	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	160	1,000	■
	C26	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	800	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	160	250,000	■
	C27	Surface	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	160	1,000	■
	C23	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	480	1,000	■
			<i>Karenia spp</i>	160	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	80	250,000	■
	C24	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp.</i>	240	1,000	■
			<i>Protoceratium reticulatum</i>	80	500	■
	C25	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	400	1,000	■
			<i>Gonyaulax spp.</i>	80	100	■
	C26	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	400	1,000	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	80	250,000	■
	C27	Bottom	<i>Gymnodinium spp</i>	240	1,000	■
			<i>Prorocentrum lima</i>	80	500	■
			<i>Pseudo-nitzschia "delicatissima" group</i>	80	250,000	■

Notes:

1. WASQAP = Western Australian Quality Assurance Program (DoF 2007, as per Water Corporation 2012).
2. Green symbols indicate the estimated cell density was below the WASQAP toxic algae trigger concentration, red symbol indicate the estimated cell density exceeded the WASQAP toxic algae trigger concentration.




5 Primary and secondary contact recreation

5.1 Sampling approach and site locations

The EQO for the EV 'Recreation' [and 'Aesthetics'] is aimed at ensuring coastal waters are safe for primary and secondary contact recreation activities such as swimming and boating, respectively. To meet the EQO, water quality around the Bunbury ocean outlet is to be maintained so that primary and secondary contact recreation is safe in all waters except those areas designated otherwise.

Water quality monitoring sites (C1–C16) are positioned along the boundary of the LEPA. On each sampling occasion (January, February and March), the five sites directly down current of the diffuser are sampled (Figure 5.1).



Notes:

1. Water quality monitoring occurred at compliance sites C7–C11 on 10 January, C1–C5 on 6 February and at C7–C11 on 6 March 2024, as a result of prevailing currents at the time of sampling.

Figure 5.1 Primary and secondary recreational contact compliance (C1-C16) sites and reference monitoring sites (WRQ1-WQR5b)



5.2 Faecal pathogens sampling

Disease-causing microorganisms (pathogens) associated with bathing areas include salmonellae, *Shigellae*, *enteropathogenic*, *Escheria coli*, cysts of *Entamoeba histolytica*, parasite ova and infectious hepatitis (Hart 1974, McNeil 1985; cited in ANZECC/ARMCANZ 2000). The most common types of diseases associated with water borne pathogens are eye, ear, nose and throat infections, skin diseases and gastrointestinal disorders (ANZECC/ARMCANZ 2000). Detecting faecal pathogens within water samples is difficult, therefore 'indicator' micro-organisms are used to assess the health risks associated with pathogens in recreational waters (Elliot & Colwell 1985; cited in ANZECC/ARMCANZ 2000).

To test for presence of pathogens, water samples were taken from the surface and bottom of the water column at compliance monitoring sites, shoreline monitoring sites, plume tracking sites and reference sites on 10 January, 6 February and 6 March 2024 and analysed for *Enterococci* spp. Samples were collected in pre-sterilised bottles before being chilled and placed in the dark. On completion of sampling, the samples were transferred to the PathWest Laboratory and analysed according to NATA-accredited methods (Appendix 5).

5.3 Faecal pathogen results

The EQG for faecal pathogens is outlined in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 *Enterococci* spp. concentrations downstream of the Bunbury ocean outlet

EQG	The 95 th percentile of pooled <i>Enterococci</i> spp. concentrations in surface waters is not to exceed 40 MPN/100 mL outside the LEPA boundary
-----	---

Source: Water Corporation (2012)

Notes:

1. EQG = Environmental quality guideline; MPN = most probable number; LEPA = low ecological protection area.

The 95th percentile of pooled *Enterococci* spp. concentrations in surface waters was 55.3 MPN/100 mL (Table 5.2). Therefore, the EQG was not met and further assessment against the EQS is required. The EQS states that 95th percentile of the pooled *Enterococci* organism data from shoreline sites, when compared against the upper National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC 2008) Category A value, should not exceed 40 MPN/100 mL. The 95th percentile of the pooled *Enterococci* organism data from shoreline sites was 10 MPN/100 mL (Table 5.3); therefore, the EQS was met.



Table 5.2 *Enterococci* spp. concentrations downstream of the Bunbury ocean outlet

Date	Compliance site	<i>Enterococci</i> spp. in surface waters (MPN/100 mL)	<i>Enterococci</i> spp. in bottom waters (MPN/100 mL)
10 January 2024	C7	10	<10
	C8	5	<10
	C9	5	<10
	C10	5	<10
	C11	5	<10
06 February 2024	C1	5	<10
	C2	5	<10
	C3	5	<10
	C4	63	<10
	C5	52	<10
06 March 2024	C7	5	<10
	C8	5	<10
	C9	5	<10
	C10	5	<10
	C11	10	<10
95th percentile of compliance sites		55.3	<10

Notes:

1. MPN = most probable number



Table 5.3 *Enterococci* spp. concentrations at the shoreline sites.

Date	Shoreline site	<i>Enterococci</i> spp. (MPN/100 mL)
10 January 2024	A	<10
	B	<10
	C	<10
	D	<10
	E	<10
	F	<10
	G	<10
	H	<10
	I	<10
06 February 2024	A	<10
	B	<10
	C	<10
	D	<10
	E	<10
	F	<10
	G	<10
	H	<10
	I	<10
06 March 2024	A	<10
	B	10
	C	<10
	D	<10
	E	<10
	F	<10
	G	<10
	H	<10
	I	<10
95th percentile of shoreline sites		10

Notes:

1. MPN = most probable number

5.4 Algal biotoxins sampling

Algal biotoxins resulting from increased nutrient loads can be harmful to human/animal health if encountered via ingestion or skin contact. Although most algal blooms are considered harmless, some may contain species that produce toxins that are harmful to humans. For this reason, phytoplankton cell counts were monitored on three sampling occasions during summer (10 January, 6 February and 6 March 2024) to ensure concentrations are occurring within acceptable guideline limits (NHMRC 2008).

5.5 Algal biotoxins results

The EQG for algal biotoxins is outlined in Table 5.4.



Table 5.4 Environmental Quality Guideline for algal biotoxins

EQG	Median total phytoplankton cell count (either from one sampling occasion or from a single site over an agreed period of time) should not exceed 10 cells/mL <i>Karenia brevis</i> and/or have <i>Lyngbya majuscula</i> and/or <i>Pfiesteria</i> sp. present in high numbers outside the LEPA
-----	--

Source: Water Corporation (2012)

Notes:

- 1. EQG = Environmental quality guideline, LEPA = low ecological protection area

Toxic algae species *Lyngbya majuscula* and *Pfiesteria* spp. were not recorded at compliance monitoring sites and median cell count of *Karenia brevis* did not exceed 10 cells/mL at the boundary of the LEPA during the 2023 summer monitoring. The EQG relevant to algal biotoxins (for the EQO, Maintenance of Primary and Secondary Contact Recreation) was met.



6 References

ANZECC/ARMCANZ (2000) National Water Quality Management Strategy Paper No 4 – Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality. Volume 1 – The Guidelines (Chapters 1–7). Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council and Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, October 2000

BMT (2018) Bunbury Wastewater Treatment Plant Ocean Outlet Monitoring Program Annual Report 2017/2018. Prepared for Water Corporation of Western Australia by BMT, Report No. 1136_001/1_Rev0, Perth, Western Australia, October 2018

Cosgrove J, Walker D, Morrison P, Hillman K (2004) Periphyton indicate effects of wastewater discharge in the near-coastal zone, Perth (Western Australia). *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 61:331–338

Costanzo SD, O'Donohue MJ, Dennison WC, Loneragan NR, Thomas M (2001) A new approach for detecting and mapping sewage impacts. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 42:149-156

DALSE (2002) Bunbury Ocean Outfall Operations EMP Marine Impacts Monitoring and Management Plan. Prepared for Water Corporation of Western Australia by DAL Science & Engineering Pty Ltd, Report No. 02/189/3, Perth, Western Australia, August 2002

DALSE (2003) Tracing Treated Wastewater from Bunbury Ocean Outfall using 15N. Prepared for Water Corporation of Western Australia by DAL Science & Engineering Pty Ltd, Report No. 275/01, Perth, Western Australia, May 2003

DoF (2013) Poisonous Algae. Department of Fisheries, Perth, Western Australia. Available from <http://www.fish.wa.gov.au/Sustainability-and-Environment/Fisheries-Science/Aquatic-Animal-Health/Pages/Poisonous-Algae.aspx> [Accessed 23 May 2014]

DoF (2007) Western Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (WASQAP) Operations Manual. Department of Fisheries, Perth, Western Australia, June 2007

DoH (2015) Western Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (WASQAP) Operations Manual. Department of Fisheries, Perth, Western Australia, May 2016

EPA (2005) Environmental Quality Criteria Reference Document for Cockburn Sound (2003–2004) – A Supporting Document to the State Environmental (Cockburn Sound) Policy 2005. Environmental Protection Authority, Report No. 20, Perth, Western Australia, January 2005

EPA (2016) Technical Guidance: Protecting the Quality of Western Australia's Marine Environment. Environmental Protection Authority, Perth, Western Australia, December 2016

EPA (2017) Environmental Quality Criteria Reference Document for Cockburn Sound – A supporting document to the State Environmental (Cockburn Sound) Policy 2015. Environmental Protection Authority, Perth, Western Australia, April 2017

McAlpine KW, Wenziker KJ, Apte SC, Masini RJ (2005) Background Quality for Coastal Marine Waters of Perth, Western Australia. Department of Environment, Perth, Western Australia, March 2005

NHMRC (2008) Guidelines for Managing Risks in Recreational Water. National Health and Medical Research Council, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, February 2008

SKM (1999) Bunbury WWTP Ocean Outlet. Prepared for GHD Pty Ltd by Sinclair Knight Merz, Perth, Western Australia, April 1999

Water Corporation (2012) Bunbury Ocean Outlet Operations EMP – Marine Impacts Monitoring and Management Plan. Water Corporation, Report No. 5542160 v3A, June 2012