## **Gregory River Management Area**

2013	Land Use	Management Practices	2007 % Adoption 			2014 % Adoption Target				2014 % Adopti Achieve	Effort realised	% of target	Draft 2021 % Adoption Target	Cost \$ '000s		
	Cane & Horticulture	Soil	💿 😳	D	С	В		С	В	AC	В	А	Н	210	New management prac	tice
N 2007		Nutrient	💿 💿	D		В	с		А	c		A	н	97	adoption targets and implementation costs w	vill be
ADOPTION		Pesticide		D		В	С		А	С		A	Н	97	determined in consultat	
рор	Grazing	Soil	💿 😳	D C				ΒA		С	ΒА	L	1	the community and stakeholders		
	Existing Urban Management	Nutrient	••• 💿	during the Water Quality NOT APPLICABLE Improvement Plan upda												
CHANGE	New Urban Development	Soil	💿 😳	NOT APPLICABLE									continuing throughout 2	2014		
				Dated practice C Common practice B Best practic								e Cutting-edge p	oractice			

		Event Freshwater Quality Values					DraftCane	&Horticultu	urePriority	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	300	535	387	391	387	L	L				L K H		16
2013	Phosphorus μg/L	30	74	54	55	54	L	L				L		
2007 -	💿 Particulate Nitrogen μg/L	CC	254	CC	243	CC	L	L		L <b>K</b> H	L	L		
	Particulate Phosphorus μg/L	CC	57	CC	50	CC	L	L		L	L			494
DUCI	Total Suspended Sediment mg/L	CC	42	CC	41	CC	L			L	L			
DAE	Ametryn μg/L	CC	<lod< td=""><td>CC</td><td>CC</td><td>CC</td><td>L</td><td></td><td>L</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></lod<>	CC	CC	CC	L		L					
LOA	Atrazine μg/L	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06	L		L					8
	   Diuron μg/L	0.31	0.41	0.31	0.31	0.31	L		L					
	θ Hexazinone μg/L	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	L		L					
	😵 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</td><td>#</td></lod<>	CC	CC	CC							L	#

 $\label{eq:CC} CC = Current \ condition; \ LOD = Limit \ of \ Detection \ which \ is \ currently \ 0.01 \ \mu g/L \ for \ all \ herbicides \\ \# \ Tebuthiuron \ is \ not \ a \ priority \ due \ to \ consistently \ low \ levels \ of \ detection \ across \ the \ region$ 

System rating (A=excellent, E=poor)				<b>D</b> (1)	<i>c</i> .			
Value rated	e rated ObjectiveCondition Target Achieved Draft 2050 2007 2014 2014 2014 2021		Target	System repair actions	Draft Priority	Cost \$ '000s		
Flow	A	С	B	С	B	Implementation of voluntary extraction agreements to maintain waterhole during low flow	L	Costs to in improvements
Barriers to Migration	A	B	A	A	A	Monitoring and maintenance fishways	L	nple
Instream Habitat	A	С	B	С	B	Restoration and stabilisation of priority reaches	L	ment system re be determined targets ha
Riparian Vegetation	A	B	A	B	A	Active restoration and connectivity of priority reaches. Grazing management on riparian land	L	repair a ed after have be
Estuary Modification	A	С	B	C	B	Active restoration and management to encourage recovery of estuarine areas	L	for ecosyste gement prac t.
Mangroves & Saltmarsh	A	B	A	B	A	Management mangroves and saltmarsh to encourage recovery	L	m health tice adoption