Eden Lassie Creek Management Area

Land Use	Land Use Management Practices Key Pollutant %		 %: 	2007 % Adoption 			2014 % Adoption Target			2014 % Adoption Achieved			Effort realised	% of target	Draft 2021 % Adoption Target	Cost \$ '000s	
Cane & Horticulture	Soil		D		В				А	D			В	L	0	New management pract	tice
	Nutrient		D	С	В	c		А	ſ	o c				Н	70	adoption targets and	
	Pesticide	•	D	С	В	C		А		D			В	L	0	implementation costs wi	
Grazing	Soil		D		В			В	А	D				L	25	the community and stak	reholders
Existing Urban Management	Nutrient					NOT APPLICABLE									during the Water Quality		
3												Improvement Plan update process					
New Urban Development	Soil			NOT APP					PPLICABLE						continuing throughout 20	014	
							Date	ed pract	ico	<i>C C</i>	omn	on nr	acti	co P Ros	t practic	Cutting-adga	oractice

Dated practice C Common practice	В	Best practice	Cutting-edge practice

		Event Freshwater Quality Values					Draft H	lorticulture	Priority	Draft Grazing Priority				Cost	
Key Pollutant		Objective 2050	Condition 2007	Target 2014	Achieved 2014	Draft Target 2021	Soil	Nutrient	Pesticide	Soil	Riparian	Nutrient	Pesticide	\$ '000s	
	DissolvedInorganic Nitrogen μg/L	CC	213	CC	CC	CC	L → H	L H				L H		27	
	Filterable Reactive Phosphorus μg/L	CC	32	CC	CC	CC	L H	L H				L H			
	Particulate Nitrogen μg/L	CC	327	CC	318	CC	L → H	L H		L H	L ← H	L H			
	Particulate Phosphorus μg/L	С	75	CC	72	CC	L → H	L H		L √ H	L → H	L √ H		1016	
	Total Suspended Sediment mg/L	CC	141	CC	139	CC	L → H			L → H	L → H				
	& Ametryn μg/L	CC	<lod< td=""><td>CC</td><td>CC</td><td>CC</td><td>L → H</td><td></td><td>L → H</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></lod<>	CC	CC	CC	L → H		L → H						
	& Atrazine μg/L	CC	<lod< td=""><td>CC</td><td>CC</td><td>CC</td><td>L → H</td><td></td><td>L H</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>44</td></lod<>	CC	CC	CC	L → H		L H					44	
	Diuron μg/L	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.00	CC	L → H		L → H						
	Rexazinone μg/L	CC	<lod< td=""><td>CC</td><td>CC</td><td>CC</td><td>L → H</td><td></td><td>L H</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></lod<>	CC	CC	CC	L → H		L H						
	(Tebuthiuron μg/L	CC	<lod< td=""><td>CC</td><td>CC</td><td>CC</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>L → H</td><td>#</td></lod<>	CC	CC	CC							L → H	#	

CC = Current condition; LOD = Limit of Detection which is currently 0.01 μ g/L for all herbicides

[#] Tebuthiuron is not a priority due to consistently low levels of detection across the region

System rating (A=excellent, E=poor)				=poor)			Draft	Cost
Value rated	Objective 2050	Condition 2007	Target 2014	Achieved 2014	Draft Target 2021	System repair actions	Priority	\$ '000s
Flow	A	B	A	B	A	Develop and implement catchment specific flow remdiation strategies	L → H	Costs to in improvements
Barriers to Migration	A	B	A	B	A	Removal of barriers to migration	L H	s to impleme nents will be
Instream Habitat	A	B	A	В	A	Restoration and stabilisation of priority reaches	L √ H	요한
Riparian Vegetation	A	В	A	В	A	Active restoration and connectivity of priority reaches. Continued grazing management on riparian land	L	pair a after ave be
Estuary Modification	A	В	A	В	A	Management to improve and maintain estuary condition	L A H	ecos
Mangroves & Saltmarsh	A	C	B	G	B	Management to improve and maintain mangrove and saltmarsh condition	L → H	system health practice adoption
4								