

Details

Meeting: Healthy Floodplains Review Committee

Location: Teleconference

Date/time: Tuesday 25 August 2020
9.00am – 3.30 pm

Chairperson: [REDACTED]

Apologies

[REDACTED] – NRAR Director Water Regulations East

[REDACTED] – NRAR Manager Floodplain Harvesting

[REDACTED] – NRAR Senior Water Regulatory Officer

[REDACTED] DPIE Water Modeller

Attendees

Committee:

1. [REDACTED], Independent Chair of the Healthy Floodplains Review Committee
2. [REDACTED] NSW Farmers Association representative, landholder from the Caroon area of the Liverpool Plains
3. [REDACTED], NSW Nature Conservation Council representative and landholder Mudgee
4. [REDACTED], NSW Irrigators Council representative, Local Irrigator and landholder, Moree

DPIE – Water Healthy Floodplains:

5. [REDACTED] - Director Healthy Floodplains
6. [REDACTED] - Manager Water Modelling
7. [REDACTED] - Principal Water Modeller
8. [REDACTED] - Lead Water Modeller
9. [REDACTED] - Lead Water Modeller
10. [REDACTED], Manager Licencing Healthy Floodplains Project, DPIE
11. [REDACTED], Senior Project Officer, DPIE
12. [REDACTED], Senior Project Officer, DPIE
13. [REDACTED], Project Officer, DPIE (minutes)

Natural Resources Access Regulator:


14. [REDACTED] - Manager Floodplain Harvesting, NRAR
15. [REDACTED] - Senior Water Regulatory Officer, NRAR
16. [REDACTED] - Senior Water Regulatory Officer, NRAR

Consultants:

17. [REDACTED] - Alluvium Consulting Pty Ltd
18. [REDACTED] - Consultant

This meeting

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible	Date due
1	Welcome	Meeting open	Chair	n/a
2	Declaring conflict of interests	None declared	Chair	
3	Healthy floodplain overview	<p>█ thanked the committee and the healthy floodplain team for their contribution to date.</p> <p>A 'Water Balance' paper and 'Other Themes' paper was sent to committee prior to this meeting. A presentation has been prepared for today.</p> <p>A draft paper and today's presentation also recently taken to industry for review.</p> <p>█ enquired when is modelling considering environmental assessment?</p> <p>█ explained that environmental assessment relates to works in the future and at licence stage. █ explained that eligible works is based on eligible works in accordance with the Floodplain Harvesting Policy.</p> <p>█ raised concerns of capacity of committee to deal with complex technical information.</p>	<p>█ to arrange further clarification for environmental consideration to █</p> <p>To be discussed at latter part of meeting</p>	

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible	Date due
4	Modelling overview	<p>Border Rivers and Gwydir valley scale and individual property models results and key changes and explained.</p> <p>To explain the models 2 reports are currently being prepared:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Model Build Report which is a technical explanation of the modelling2. Scenarios Report which outlines the changes that will be made to Water Sharing Plans plan limits. <p>Currently they are being independently reviewed before being published in October.</p> <p>The modelling is capability of floodplain harvesting, not an entitlement – that will come later after reports, regulation and water sharing plan changes.</p>		

5	Analysis of the floodplain harvesting modelling methodology	<p>█████ explained that he was engaged by DPIE to assess the farm scale modelling submissions process from a technical view and review of the draft allocations. Has found that the model and eligibility process (review submissions) was equitable and fair and robust.</p> <p>A report on the findings has been prepared and distributed to department and committee.</p> <p>A recommendation to improve the landholder information requested by the department for evidence required has been taken up by Department and the FAQ's improved.</p> <p>By modelling valley wide data and then applying long term climatic data that is then applied back to the individual farm scale there will be 'winners and losers' but there is not any better method available as there is no other information available. The farm scale estimates could be improved if better data available. The model can test the ML/ha in the future in collaboration with industry stakeholders ie. test the model against real life data.</p> <p>Production used to verify historic water use, this approach should continue to be used and the model needs to be cross checked against actual in the future.</p> <p>Local scale rainfall runoff policy is still being developed and needs more work. It is not able to be better modelled at this time as there is no other way due to data available. The data is reasonable currently.</p> <p>It is recognised by Industry that the submission process is the</p>	██████████	
---	---	--	------------	--

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible	Date due
		<p>only opportunity for landholder to comment on the future 'share of the pie' therefore is very important. The process needs to continue to maintain confidence in the process.</p> <p>Where there is a decrease for a property there needs to be an opportunity for land holder to make submission.</p>		
6	Discussion	<p>The committee raised concerns about endorsing the valley models due to the technical detail required and committee are not comfortable taking on that level of responsibility.</p> <p>A further meeting is requested to endorse an alternative method of using an independent expert to provide a review of the modelling of each valley to compare to other valley models, and to provide and a summary of the analysis to the committee to endorse.</p> <p>A discussion occurred on the requirement of the person to be independent, a specialist and respected by both academia and the Industry.</p>	<p>██████ to organise further meeting to discuss.</p> <p>██████ identified that there would be limited people available with the high level of expertise required. ████████ has expert knowledge, independence and has detailed experience in the project and has Industry recognition.</p>	Committee meeting held 31 August 2020.
	Break	<p>Meeting paused at 9.53 am, reconvened at 10.05 am.</p> <p>Modellers and consultants left meeting.</p>		

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible	Date due
7	Review of submissions		All	n/a
	Submission # BD 003 [REDACTED]			
	Submission # BD019 [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]			
	Submission # BD023 [REDACTED]			
	Submission # BRO19 [REDACTED]			
	Submission # BRO20 [REDACTED]			
	Submission # BR013 [REDACTED]			
8	Meeting close	3.30pm	Chair	n/a

Submission Outcomes

Submission number and property	Issue	Comment	Committee Determination	Actions
BD003 [REDACTED]	1. Requesting amendment of pump FPH16 from 300mm to 660mm with flow rate of 120 ML/day.		Recommend: That pump FPH 16 amended from 300mm to 660 mm centrifugal not be supported as eligible works, pump capacity to remain at 28.8ML/day.	
	2. Contesting storage volume FPH 1, FPH 2 and FPH 3.		Recommend: FPH 1 – support storage capacity increase of 32.5 from 470 to 502.5ML FPH 2 – support storage capacity increase of 552.9ML from 1050 ML to 1602.9ML FPH 3 – storage capacity to remain at 220ML/day based on SBN data	

			A total increase for property of 585 ML from 1740 ML to 2325 ML.	
	3. Requesting surge area approximately 150ML of water, stored using gate 12 (FPH 12).		Recommend: Out of spec for committee. Refer to modellers.	
	4. Requesting additional field 10 storage.	Field 10 has never been used for surge or storage and is considered not as eligible work. To be included in WSWA it would need to be surveyed for volume and with monitoring of take.	Recommend: That temporary field storage 10 is not supported as does not meet floodplain harvesting criteria.	
BD019 ██████████ ██████████	1. Contesting storage volumes FPH 1, FPH3 and FPH 4.		Recommend: FPH 1 - support increase in storage capacity of 298ML from 1070ML to 1368ML FPH 3 north - support NRAR storage capacity of 310ML due to lack of any other evidence FPH 4 - support increase 139 ML from 130ML to 269ML.	
	2. Contesting pump capacity FPH 10 from 99 ML/day to 140ML/day axial and FPH11 from 120ML/day to 155ML/day centrifugal.		Recommend: FPH 10 - support amendment for pump size from 660mm to 610mm, an increase in capacity from 99 ML/day to 140ML/day FPH11- support increase in capacity of pump from 120ML/day to 155ML/day.	

BD023 ██████████	1. Contesting storage volume at FPH 1.		Recommend: FPH 1 – storage capacity of by 2932.87 ML/day from 2140ML to a total of 5072.87 ML.	
	3. Contesting pump capacity at FPH8 from 120 ML/day to 154 ML/day.		Recommend: FPH 8 – support change in 660mm pump capacity from 120 ML/day to 155 ML/day.	
Returning Submission				
BRO19 ██████████	2. Contesting pump capacity FPH 11 (120 ML/day to 140 ML/day each pump.		Recommend: FPH 11 - Support increase of pump capacity from 120ML/ to 140ML/day for a total of 278ML/day.	
	3. Requesting additional pump at 140 ML/day.		Recommend: FPH 13 – support inclusion of eligible work of 660mm pump with a daily capacity of 140ML/day.	
Returning Submission				
BRO20 ██████████ ██████	2. Contesting storage volume FPH 5.		Recommend: FPH 5 – support increase in capacity from 120ML/day to 142ML/day.	
	5. Requesting additional 2 x 1500mm pipes.		Recommend: FPH 5 – support inclusion of 2 x 1500mm pipes as eligible works.	
Returning Submission				
BR013 ██████	1. Contesting storage volume x FPH 1 and FPH 3.		Recommend: FPH 1 – storage volume to remain at 2380 ML	

			FPH 3 – storage volume increase of 20 ML from 70 ML to 90 ML.	
--	--	--	---	--

Meeting closed

3.30pm

Next meeting

31 August 2020 (teleconference)