



FLOODPLAIN HARVESTING

Proposed floodplain harvesting rules for the Gwydir Valley

Submissions from public consultation

2 August 2021



Published by NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

dpie.nsw.gov.au

Title: Proposed floodplain harvesting rules for the Gwydir Valley

First published: August 2021

Department reference number: PUB21/465

© State of New South Wales through Department of Planning, Industry and Environment 2021. You may copy, distribute, display, download and otherwise freely deal with this publication for any purpose provided you attribute the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment as the owner. However, you must obtain permission if you wish to charge others for access to the publication (other than at cost); include the publication in advertising or a product for sale; modify the publication; or republish the publication on a website. You may freely link to the publication on a departmental website.

Disclaimer: The information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing (August 2021) and may not be accurate, current or complete. The State of New South Wales (including the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment), the author and the publisher take no responsibility, and will accept no liability, for the accuracy, currency, reliability or correctness of any information included in the document (including material provided by third parties). Readers should make their own inquiries and rely on their own advice when making decisions related to material contained in this publication.

Acknowledgment of Country

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment acknowledges the Traditional Owners and Custodians of the land on which we live and work and pays respect to Elders past, present and future.

Contents

Submissions	5
Submission 1	5
Submission 2	7
Submission 3	11
Submission 4	14
Submission 5	18
Submission 6	23
Submission 7	25
Submission 8	27
Submission 9	29
Submission 10	31
Submission 11	33
Submission 12	35
Submission 13	37
Submission 14	39
Submission 15	41
Submission 16	43
Submission 17	46
Submission 18	50
Submission 19	54
Submission 20	58
Submission 22	62
Submission 23	66
Submission 24	70
Submission 25	74
Submission 26	78
Submission 27	82
Submission 28	87
Submission 29	91
Submission 30	95
Submission 31	99
Submission 32	103
Submission 33	107
Submission 34	110
Submission 35	113

Submission 36	115
Submission 37	117
Submission 38	119
Submission 39	121
Submission 40	124
Submission 41	126
Submission 42	128
Submission 43	131
Submission 44	134
Submission 45	136
Submission 46	138
Submission 47	140
Submission 48	142
Submission 49	144
Submission 50	146
Submission 51	148
Submission 52	150
Submission 53	152
Submission 54	154
Submission 55	156
Submission 56	162
Submission 57	168
Submission 58	174
Submission 59	180
Submission 60	186
Submission 61	195
Submission 62	202
Submission 63	204
Submission 64	206
Submission 65	208
Submission 66	210
Submission 67	216
Submission 68	219
Submission 69	222
Submission 70	225
Submission 71	227
Submission 72	231

Submission 73	233
Submission 74	236
Submission 75	239
Submission 76	243
Submission 77	247
Submission 78	251
Submission 79	255
Submission 80	259
Submission 81	263
Submission 82	268
Submission 83	274
Submission 84	278
Submission 85	282
Submission 86	286
Submission 87	290
Submission 88	293
Submission 89	296
Submission 90	299
Submission 91	305
Submission 92	311
Submission 93	317
Submission 94	323
Submission 95	328
Submission 96	335
Submission 97	342
Submission 98	349
Submission 99	356
Submission 100	363
Submission 101	366
Submission 102	368
Submission 103	372
Submission 104	375
Submission 105	379

Submissions

Public exhibition of the proposed rules began in the Gwydir valley on 12 February and ended 12 March 2021. Submissions received during the public consultation process have been collated and can be found in this document. Please note only submissions where approval was given to publish have been included.

Submission 1

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: Nathaniel Phillis

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? N/A

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling and Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: Agree that licensing, metering and reports underpins long term sustainability

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: We have a variable environment that seems to be either Drought or flood. A spread, adaptive approach is needed.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: No comment

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: This would cause a restriction of trade, devaluing the market

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Another layer of unnecessary complexity

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Again more uncertainty in our community which relies on irrigation agriculture.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: As per previous explanation

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

18.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 2

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. If other, please specify: Gwydir Valley

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I managed to keep my 15 staff employed during drought thanks to the reserves that I managed to build up. This was from the last boom year in our region of 2016, when there was moderate flooding in some areas of the region and great river flows. If we are forced to miss this next flood, then I have exhausted my reserves and I may not make the next flood. I also provide retail goods to the local community and in years when there is rainfall and a flood, I am able to generate the income needed to keep myself and my employees employed. We also try to buy new equipment and spend more money in the town. A flood and full dams gives us confidence to upgrade our trucks for better service

and reliability and to look for opportunities to expand the business in the region. Dry times are about survival and is a very draining time. To miss a flood and the associated benefits is catastrophic for our town. It was devastating to see the shop closures and services withdrawn from our community. The towns morale is flat when people have to leave the bush because of limited work opportunities, and unfortunately they don't come back. City or coastal life is so much easier. Losing experienced staff also puts massive pressure on our business as replacing good people is getting harder and harder. We are committed to town. Our staff, accountants, lawyers, servicing people, all live in town. The majority of money used to run our business stays in town. If the Region is forced to miss this next flood and we are into an extended drought I am not sure there is viability to continue to operate without the boom to carry me to the next drought.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I managed to keep my 15 staff employed during the drought thanks to the reserves that I managed to build up. This was from the last boom year in our region of 2016, when there was moderate flooding in some areas of the region and great river flows. If we are forced to miss this next flood, then I have exhausted my reserves and I may not make the next flood. I also provide retail goods to the local community and in years when there is rainfall and a flood, I am able to generate the income needed to keep myself and my employees employed. We also try to buy new equipment and spend more money in the town. A flood and full dams gives us confidence to upgrade our trucks for better service and reliability and to look for opportunities to expand the business in the region. Dry times are about survival and is a very draining time. To miss a flood and the associated benefits is catastrophic for our town. It was devastating to see the shop closures and services withdrawn from our community. The towns morale is flat when people have to leave the bush because of limited work opportunities, and

unfortunately they don't come back. City or coastal life is so much easier. Losing experienced staff also puts massive pressure on our business as replacing good people is getting harder and harder. We are committed to town. Our staff, accountants, lawyers, servicing people, all live in town. The majority of money used to run our business stays in town. If the Region is forced to miss this next flood and we are into an extended drought I am not sure there is viability to continue to operate without the boom to carry me to the next drought. If the region is forced to miss this next flood and we are into an extended drought I am not sure there is viability to continue to operate without the boom to carry me to the next drought.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Report to assist community consultation

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Moree is a very proud, historic town with great diversity and energy. Floods keep our town a float. It enables us to maximise the full potential of the stored water throughout the dry times. This ensures there is enough income to maintain our staff and continue our sustainable farm practices.

Submission 3

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community Member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Peer review and Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing

our community's ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future".

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 4

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Modelling, and Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, when water is in abundance, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access a small volume of water when it is excess and store it for use times when rainfall and river flow is limited. This provides our community and the agricultural industry increased certainty around water available for irrigation. Remembering that the irrigation industry accounts for 42% of the over \$2.1 billion that agriculture in the region is valued at. A value that is worth more than twice that, \$4.6 billion to the community.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I believe it is important for water users to be compliant with their rules. I do not believe the impacts of transitioning to these licences should be carried by the community. The Gwydir has been over recovered by more than 9GL and the community was ignored doing this water recovery, in this situation the community is again being ignored by government. We are still trying to recover from drought, each one of the government barriers stalls our recovery. Why have northern communities not acknowledged or considered by government in the implementation of these licences. This is especially concerning given the negligible environmental or downstream benefits of the policy. Why should downstream communities be seen as more important than our? If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This is unfair for upstream communities, who's interests have been completely ignored in this process. This

will result in the region being in an extended drought, as we are now. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. The current drought has taken over 75% of my business, my customers are still trying to catch up and the continuous attack on the livelihoods of northern Basin communities has got to stop. Our community has already worn the cost of buy backs, over 200 jobs, a 14% decline in population and erosion of services. It is time government policy gave upstream northern communities who are already over recovered, recognition for the enormous contribution they have made to restoring the health of the basin.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Over recovered water must be returned to production so that northern basin communities can survive. Agriculture employs 25% of our population and generates up to 84% of income in the border rivers Gwydir. Every dollar generated from agriculture (\$2.1 billion) circles through our economy at least twice, \$4.6 billion, 42% of that value comes from Irrigation. If there is water that should be available to the local industry then governments, have a responsibility to make that water available. Our communities need it we cannot carry anymore of the costs. The basin plan was supposed to have social, economic and environmental balance, our community has not seen that balance.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our

region is highly dependant on agriculture 84% of income is generated from agriculture, and irrigated agriculture which accounts for 42% of the value of agricultural production. When water is available, it provides our region an opportunity to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's confidences and ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Ironically as an inland terminal river we have almost no impact on down stream flows. If government does not start to be balanced in their approach to water reform it is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I believe it is important for water users to be compliant with their rules. I do not believe the impacts of transitioning to these licences should be carried by the community. The Gwydir has been over recovered by more than 9GL and the community was ignored doing this water recovery, in this situation the community is again being ignored by government. We are still trying to recover from drought, each one of the government barriers stalls our recovery. Why have northern communities not acknowledged or considered by government in the implementation of these licences. This is especially concerning given the negligible environmental or downstream benefits of the policy. Why should downstream communities be seen as more important than our? If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This is unfair for upstream communities, who's interests have been completely ignored in this process. This will result in the region being in an extended drought, as we are now. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. The current drought has taken over 75% of my business, my customers are still trying to catch up and the continuous attack on the livelihoods of northern Basin communities has got to stop. Our community has already worn the cost of buy backs, over 200 jobs, a 14% decline in population and erosion of services. It is time government policy gave upstream northern communities who are already over recovered, recognition for the enormous contribution they have made to restoring the health of the basin.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: In your report to assist community consultation you state that there are four primary considerations (p9) you note risk to the environment and down stream communities. Where is your consideration of upstream communities. Why are upstream communities ignored? This is unacceptable, and we are tired of being the scape goats for everyone else problems, we have had enough of being ignored.

Submission 5

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** Ian Cole

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Peer review

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I totally support the licencing, monitoring, metering, and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. And I am disappointed that 20-years after other NSW water entitlements were brought into a legal framework, floodplain harvesting remains out of that licencing framework. It is also disappointing that the state government cannot provide entitlement holders with adequate information to make an informed decision around how to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing all water users and all communities directly impacted by this FPH reform. Consultation around local, valley-based rules seems to be an academic exercise at this time, as the parliament has not agreed to support the framework to enable licencing to occur. The Water Management (General) Amendment (Floodplain Harvesting) Regulation 2021 must be agreed to before valley-based rules can be drafted, the benefits and impacts modelled, and consulted with impacted water users and communities. Consequently, I support in-principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in these northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling, and water is abundant. These rules must allow for peak use at those rare times when the rivers are flooding, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use. This sort of accounting approach provides certainty for our local industry and the community. It is essential that this certainty of water access is available while ensuring overall limits can be achieved in the longer-term. These rules must consider the risks to local communities losing production, commercial activity, along with the risk to the environment and downstream communities which already seem to have been considered. Also, the community impact of accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take in the Gwydir, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares, the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. This compares with under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-

year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. The state government's intention is to licence this historical form of take (FPH) within defined limits, no more or no less. This is not an exercise in environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental and hydrological benefits. To achieve the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative social and economic impact of this reform on communities, and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and moderated by government, to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on affected regions.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: The negative community impacts of transitioning to FPH licences has been ignored by government and must be acknowledged. The intention of government is to licence an historical form of take called floodplain harvesting licencing, within defined limits, no more or no less. This is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. In achieving this I support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. The Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association submission provides much more information on this matter. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not put in place and a flood occurs in the first years of the new arrangements, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The reduction would be far greater than the long-term requirements, and it will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs like the floods in 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are in place, there could be \$1.1B of economic losses in the Gwydir community, which cannot be regained. This will drive the community into a government enforced drought, and the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance) water will be foregone, but at least the Gwydir industry and community could have a share in the flows. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is not new and not without precedent, eg: the Gwydir Groundwater Plan. Under any licencing approach, unless there is a flood, there is no benefit to industry, community, or environment. However, a flood provides massive opportunities for all.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, especially if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is an essential mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which

are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides to exit the industry, he or she needs to an opportunity to sell entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry. If there were no trade, water would be lost for production and lost from the community. And; If an environmental water holder decides to purchase additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the NWI and basin plan trade rules. Willing buyers with reductions under the FPH plan should be able to enter the market to restore their historic levels. An unrestricted market provides this mechanism. This allows for greater market flexibility and removes the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical. Applications to transfer entitlement above current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect environmental water must be implemented. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these highly variable systems. Active management will serve to limit access because there is limited information on how floodplains work, and localised rainfall events can create sudden flushes and localised flooding. Existing water management and monitoring systems are inadequate in these situations and there are significant risks of active management being implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule on those being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits it makes sense to undertake a socio-economic impact assessment.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process, especially as they do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. These amendments acknowledge that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires the recalibration of a valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering, and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am disappointed that 20-years after other entitlements

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: The negative community impacts of transitioning to FPH licences has been ignored by government and must be acknowledged. The intention of government is to licence an historical form of take called floodplain harvesting licencing, within defined limits, no more or no less. This is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. In achieving this I support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. The Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association submission provides much more information on this matter. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not put in place and a flood occurs in the first years of the new arrangements, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The reduction would be far greater than the long-term requirements, and it will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs like the floods in 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are in place, there could be \$1.1B of economic losses in the Gwydir community, which cannot be regained. This will drive the community into a government enforced drought, and the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance) water will be foregone, but at least the Gwydir industry and community could have a share in the flows. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is not new and not without precedent, eg: the Gwydir Groundwater Plan. Under any licencing approach, unless there is a flood, there is no benefit to industry, community, or environment. However, a flood provides massive opportunities for all.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect environmental water must be implemented. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these highly variable systems. Active management will serve to limit access because there is limited information on how floodplains work, and localised rainfall events can create sudden flushes and localised flooding. Existing water management and monitoring systems are inadequate in these situations and there are significant risks of active management being implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule on those being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits it makes sense to undertake a socio-economic impact assessment.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is an essential mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. Trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence, especially when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments will be implemented. The amendments need to clearly articulate that process, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of the community on any future decisions. These amendments demonstrate that there is no perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires the recalibration of a valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A**20. Your feedback:**

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 6

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. If other, please specify: Broken Hill

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: Keep It Simple. Return to uniformity when possible to avoid confusion.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: Keep It Simple. Return to uniformity when possible to avoid confusion.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: No comment

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. Please explain your rationale: ...and No. If must trade, it must be very local to physical site of initial licence. Same watercourse, same region of flow, and not too far upstream. Good to not impinge on protected regions.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Must protect planned overbank environmental / cultural flows from floodplain harvesting.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Sound good, and necessary, however the devil is in the detail. Please ensure in the wording the emphasis is to improve downstream outcomes, not return shares to the irrigation lobby. I warn you today, you will reap the outcomes tomorrow.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Please consider response to Q 8.1. If Access Rules to prohibit access until downstream flow targets are met were sufficient in protecting the whole system to Wentworth, I would agree to this proposal.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Keep it Simple. And uniform.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: When environmental or cultural water is intended as an overbanker, leave it be.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: I'm not happy with any water trading. If it must be traded, it seems to be a good attempt at environmental harm minimisation.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: Sound good, and necessary, however the devil is in the detail. Please ensure in the wording the emphasis is to improve downstream outcomes, not return shares to the irrigation lobby. I warn you today, you will reap the outcomes tomorrow.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Report to assist community consultation

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Amendment provisions: Sound good, and necessary, however the devil is in the detail. Please ensure in the wording the emphasis is to improve downstream outcomes, not return shares to the irrigation lobby. I warn you today, you will reap the outcomes tomorrow.

Submission 7

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them "subject to further changes". They undermine confidence in the process and in our region.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 8

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** Robert McLaughlin

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. **If other, please specify:** Orange

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Modelling, Peer review

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This is another form of the 500 0/0 carryover rule and gives higher user access over time.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood - dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licensed entitlement should not be a larger volume of water.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Until FPH is metered there is no accurate understanding of the volumes of flood waters being taken.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Area of high environmental and cultural importance from increased water extraction.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is a requirement of the Basin Plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There must be the ability to change FPH rules in water sharing to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Access to FPH in unregulated rivers should be restricted to annual access rules to maintain consistency with rules with all river systems in the Gwydir.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licensed entitlement should not be a larger entitlement.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: it is a requirement of the Basin Plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: It is of the most importance to protect areas of high environmental importance and cultural value from increased water extraction.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be the ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation from the public purse.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Rules must restrict FPH until end of system flow targets are met, to ensure that flood flows reach the Barwon-Darling before FPH commences upstream

Submission 9

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** Helen Stokes

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: No comment

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It gives more access to water, over time.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Our ecosystems are 'bust and boom', after droughts flood-water must be allowed to recharge the aquifers.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** We have to be able to measure the amount of flood water being harvested.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Areas of important environmental value will be damaged by increased water extraction.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Held Environmental Water shouldn't be extracted, this is one of the requirements of the Basin Plan. The Plan has won plaudits from overseas experts.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** FPH rules need to be able to be changed to reflect different conditions.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: All the river systems in the Gwydir should be under annual access rules, because of the extremes of Australian weather.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: This is like question 9. The initial access to licenced water should not be increased because we mustn't create a desert.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: As with regulated river licences, it is required by the Basin Plan.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Areas of important environmental value should not be subject to increased water taking.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: FPH rules need to be able to be changed to reflect different conditions.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Regulating FPH is important for the health of the Gwydir wetlands with their fish and water birds, as well as letting flood waters reach the Barwon-Darling. The system flow targets should be met before FPH is begun upstream.

Submission 10

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Coastal region

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: No comment

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. Please explain your rationale: This is too long a period; it would allow greater access to water over time and it another way of applying the 500% carry over rule

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: Floods are an essential means for ecosystems to recover from drought; they are a lifeline for downstream communities and to recharge groundwater. Floods drive so many aspects of renewal in plant and animals communities. The initial access to licences entitlement should not be a larger volume.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: Floodplain Harvesting is not currently metered in a reliable manner, so there is no baseline against which to measure the quantity of water being harvested from floods.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Different zones have different environmental and cultural values; those with the highest values should not be subjected to the same standard as zones with lower values.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: The Murray Darling Basin Plan requires Held Environmental Water to be protected from extraction

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: FPH rules should be flexible enough in water sharing plans to avoid the potential for compensation payouts from the State coffers

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Floodplain Harvesting access in unregulated rivers should be controlled by the same annual rules that apply across all the Gwydir river systems

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: As I responded in 9.1 above, Floods are an essential means for ecosystems to recover from drought; they are a lifeline for downstream communities and to recharge groundwater. Floods drive so many aspects of renewal in plant and animals communities. The initial access to licences entitlement should not be a larger volume.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: As I responded in 13.1, The Murray Darling Basin Plan requires Held Environmental Water to be protected from extraction

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Because areas of high cultural and environmental value must be protected from increased water extraction

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: As I responded in 14.1, FPH rules should be flexible enough in water sharing plans to avoid the potential for compensation payouts from the State coffers

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: FPH must be controlled by rules that prevent access to floodwaters until the targets for 'end of system flow' are met. FPH should not begin upstream until flood flows have reached the Barwon-Darling.

Submission 11

1. **Who are you representing?**
 - 1.1. **Name:** N/A
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Southern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:**
4. **Attended Gwydir public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Environmental
8. **Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences:** No comment
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Environmental
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Environmental
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** No comment
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
14. **Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)?** No
 - 14.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
15. **What initial Available Water Determination would you support?** No comment
 - 15.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
16. **Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences?** No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Environmental

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Environmental. Leave the rivers alone!

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Predicted environmental outcomes

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: STOP KILLING OUR RIVERS WITH YOUR WATER HARVESTING, CHANNELS AND WEIRS! Please stop wiping out our ecosystems, and the wildlife that rely on them. No more harvesting!

Submission 12

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** Sarah Moles

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. **If other, please specify:** Inland Southern Queensland valley

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This is the 500% carryover rule in disguise. 500% is totally unacceptable. Over time, more water will be taken

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume reliant on important flood flows.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There is still no accurate understanding of the volumes of water being taken by floodplain harvesting. There must be room to amend licenced volumes as our understanding improves

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the protection of areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction. I support trading within designated zones where there is no increase in total take

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The Basin Plan is required to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Access to FPH in unregulated rivers should be restricted to annual access rules to maintain consistency with rules across all river systems in the Gwydir.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume reliant on important flood flows.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: CEWH's water must be protected from extraction!

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid triggering tax-payer funded compensation

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report, Floodplain harvesting measurement, Modelling, Predicted environmental outcomes

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: I've had insufficient time to read and consider the resources provided

Submission 13

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** William Ashby

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This is another form of 500% carryover rule and gives higher access to water over time

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery especially for flood dependent ecosystems downstream communities and groundwater recharge initial access

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Until FPH is metered there is no accurate understanding of how much water is taken from flood flows

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There must be the ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plan to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Rules must restrict FPH ACCESS until end of system flow targets are met to ensure that flood flows reach the Barwon darling before FPH commences

Submission 14

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Coastal region

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. Please explain your rationale: This is another form of 500% carryover rule and gives higher access to water over time

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery especially for flood dependent ecosystems downstream communities and groundwater recharge initial access

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: Until FPH Is metered there is no accurate understanding of how much water is taken from flood flows

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. Please explain your rationale: It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

13. Please explain your rationale: It is basic requirement of the Basin Plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction

14. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

14.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be the ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plan to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse

15. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Access to FPH in unregulated rivers should be restricted to annual access rules to maintain consistency with rules across all river systems in the Gwydir catchment.

16. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume.

17. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: It is a requirement of the Basin Plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction.

18. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction.

19. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

19.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse.

20. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

21. Your feedback:

21.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Rules must restrict FPH access until end of system flow targets are met, to ensure that flood flows reach the Barwon-Darling before FPH commences upstream.

Submission 15

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Orange

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Peer Review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. Please explain your rationale: This is another form of 500% carryover rule and gives higher access to water over time

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

9. Please explain your rationale: A critical part of drought recovery are flood events especially for flood - dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licensed entitlement should not be a larger water volume

10. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

10.1. Please explain your rationale: Until FPH Is metered there is no accurate understanding of how much water is taken from flood flows

11. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

12. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction

13. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: It is basic requirement of the Basin Plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction

14. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

14.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be the ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plan to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse

15. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Access to FPH in unregulated rivers should be restricted to annual access rules to maintain consistency with rules across all river systems in the Gwydir catchment.

16. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume.

17. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: It is a requirement of the Basin Plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction.

18. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction.

19. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

19.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse.

20. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

21. Your feedback:

21.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Rules must restrict FPH access until end of system flow targets are met, to ensure that flood flows reach the Barwon-Darling before FPH commences upstream.

Submission 16

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Peer Review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an

opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future".

Proposed water sharing plan rules for floodplain harvesting in the Gwydir unregulated river water source

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future".

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 17

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community group

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy many businesses in our community. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will negatively impact our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: No comment

9.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community's survival to be put at risk.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy many businesses in our community. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will negatively impact our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 18

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: McGregor Gourlay Agriculture Services

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: The damage that the new rules will inflict on the local economy are out of all proportion to the relatively tiny gains made downstream. Not being able to take advantage of a flood such as we saw in 2011/12 makes no sense whatsoever if the bulk of that water isn't going to end up downstream, which is the case here. The economic activity that was generated here for YEARS out of that flood was vital to helping the community ride out the actual droughts that were to come, rather than this proposed government inflicted drought.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Report to assist community consultation

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Huge amounts of economic activity are going to be destroyed for little downstream gain if this law is pushed through. Who is going to be blamed when there are future droughts and there are no irrigators left to point the finger at? Beyond the farm gate there are businesses, contractors and families who are being greatly impacted. Why don't they matter as well?

Submission 19

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This is unfair for upstream communities, who's interests have been completely ignored in this process. This will result in the region being in an extended drought, as we are now. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. The current drought has taken over 75% of my business, my customers are still trying to catch up and the continuous attack on the livelihoods of northern Basin communities has got to stop. Our community has already worn the cost of buy backs, over 200 jobs, a 14% decline in population and the erosion of services. It is time government policy gave upstream northern communities who are already over recovered, recognition for the enormous contribution they have made to restoring the health of the basin. The most frustrating thing is that massive costs to

community are having negligible environmental benefit, and our closed river has almost no downstream impacts. When will our rights be recognised?

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient.

Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant,

unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Our community has been completely disregarded in the assessment of floodplain harvesting licenses we are continually asked to give back, we are 9GL over recovered but this has not been considered. We are a terminal inland system water reform only benefits our region. The Gwydir wetlands and all the other environmental assets have over one third of the existing licenses and the ECA and the first in river flows and 50% of supplementary flows. What about our community.

Submission 20

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: Sam Copeman

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: No

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: The damage that the new rules will inflict on the local economy are out of all proportion to the relatively tiny gains made downstream. Not being able to take advantage of a flood such as we saw in 2011/12 makes no sense whatsoever if the bulk of that water isn't going to end up downstream, which is the case here. The economic activity that was generated here for YEARS out of that flood was vital to helping the community ride out the actual droughts that were to come, rather than this proposed government inflicted drought.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report**20. Your feedback:**

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: I am a business owner so i would like to educate myself about my environment to make a informed decision about my future in this region or to move to more a area that has better prospects. The business community is not being engaged by the state government in a ergonomic manner. We feel like were not meant to know so we cannot make educated decisions to benefit our future.

Submission 22

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Modelling

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should

be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Report to assist community consultation

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Huge amounts of economic activity are going to be destroyed for little downstream gain if this law is pushed through. Who is going to be blamed when there are future droughts and there are no irrigators left to point the finger at? Beyond the farm gate there are businesses, contractors and families who are being greatly impacted. Why don't they matter as well?

Submission 23

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: McGregor Gourlay Agriculture Services

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should

be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade

zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report, Modelling

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: I would like to see more detail on the economic impacts and multipliers through the community from the reduction in water allocation. The business I work for is reducing dramatically in Australia and we have been forced to move a significant amount of our business offshore to remain viable.

Submission 24

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Modelling

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: No comment

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements,

which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for

peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no

longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 25

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should

be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 26

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. If other, please specify: NW Slopes and Plains

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I usually employ 9 full time staff but after flood events, I increase this to almost double to meet the demand of workload. Whilst our Aerial Spraying operation does not require the need to harvest overland flow, we do heavily rely on our clients having the right to do so. Without their access to water supply, they can not grow a sustainable crop and therefore, our business will suffer immensely as there will be nothing for us to spray in a 'normal season'. If the local industry is forced to miss the next flooding opportunity then I will not have the increased demand and be able to employ the additional staff and be in extended drought. It will also have a slow on impact to the local community and businesses

we utilise and support on a regular basis. During the drought, I managed to keep my 9 staff employed thanks to the reserves that are managed by our clients. This was from the last boom year in our region of 2016, when there was moderate flooding in some areas of the region and great river flows. If our clients are forced to miss this next flood, then I will be in a dire situation in terms of maintaining staff employment and community support.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region.

The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 27

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** John Seery

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Peer review

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. <What has drought meant to you and the importance of a flood as a business owner> FOR EXAMPLE: I usually employ XX people but after floods I increase this to match demand. If the local industry is forced to miss the next flooding opportunity then I will not have the increased demand and be able to employ the additional staff and be in extended drought. FOR EXAMPLE: I managed to keep my XX staff employed (or my job) during drought thanks to the reserves that I managed to build up (or my employer secured). This was from the last boom year in our region of 2016, when there was moderate flooding in some areas of the region and great river flows. If we are forced to miss this next flood, then I have exhausted my reserves (or my employer

has exhausted their reserves) and I may not make the next flood. FOR EXAMPLE: I provide retail goods to the local community and in years when there is rainfall and a flood, I am able to generate the income needed to keep myself and my casual employees open when times are tougher. If the region is forced to miss this next flood and we are into an extended drought I am not sure there is viability to continue to operate without the boom to carry me to the next drought.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region.

The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report, Modelling, Other, Predicted environmental outcomes

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region.

The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work.

Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”.

Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year. Huge amounts of economic activity are going to be destroyed for little downstream gain if this law is pushed through. Who is going to be blamed when there are future droughts and there are no irrigators left to point the finger at? Beyond the farm gate there are businesses, contractors and families who are being greatly impacted. Why don't they matter as well?

Submission 28

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. We usually employ 4 people but after floods I increase this to match demand. If the local industry is forced to miss the next flooding opportunity then I will not have the increased demand and be able to employ the additional staff and be in extended drought. We managed to keep our 4 staff employed during drought thanks to the reserves that I managed to build up. This was from the last boom year in our region of 2016, when there was moderate flooding in some areas of the region and great river flows. If we are forced to miss this next flood, then I have exhausted my reserves and I may not make the next flood. We purchase retail goods in the local community and in years when there is

rainfall and a flood, I am able to generate the income needed to keep myself and my employees spending in our town. If the region is forced to miss this next flood and we are into an extended drought I am not sure there is viability to continue to operate without the boom to carry me to the next drought.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is

available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

Proposed water sharing plan rules for floodplain harvesting in the Gwydir unregulated river water source

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 29

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Southern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should

be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 30

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should

be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A**20. Your feedback:**

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 31

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should

be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Report to assist community consultation

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: The regional communities are relying on the government to action this in a manner appropriate to the current and future stakeholders of regional communities. Towns, schools, businesses, families etc in these communities are the stakeholders and they mostly rely on local agriculture for income and support.

Submission 32

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** Hayden Wiblen

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report**20. Your feedback:**

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: I work for a local business and need to be informed to make the decision to benefit me and my family. If the state government is engaging in a vendetta against this rural community i need to know.

Submission 33

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. If other, please specify: Live in Sydney with property within Macquarie catchment area

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. Please explain your rationale: This will just mean large amounts of water can be used at one time to the detriment of the environment and waterway connectivity. Carry over for FPH water is a very misleading term as it is artificially "carrying over" water that doesn't actually exist unlike someone who may not use their full allocation within an allocated year and carry that over.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: More environmentally sensible approach and better aligned with sustainable use of water

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: flexibility and responsiveness is critical in management of growth in water use and strong compliance with sustainable limits - this ensures protection of water dependent ecosystems and their resilience in adapting to the drier and more variable conditions of a changing climate.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade of FPH licences is potentially a very risky business for protection of the environment. Floodplains have been exploited and poorly understood. All floodplains contain significant ecological values and connectivity within water systems should be the priority even though FPH trade entitlements are permitted within the MDB Plan.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Strong rules to protect both held environmental water and planned environmental water is part of a government commitment to improve the ecological health of the connected water systems of

the MD river system. Government has been slow to take genuine action on the protection of our most important waterways.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: What water can be taken during a flood event needs to be clearly stated at the beginning of a flood event and consistent with the achievement of well considered flow targets across the connected water system. This could mean placing limits on access to ensure the intent of NSW water laws are met and genuine environmental protection occurs. Overbank flows are vitally important to improved ecosystem health.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Unregulated water systems are critically important to the healthy connectivity of water systems as they mirror natural conditions much better than the risks associated with release of environmental water from regulated systems.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Environmental water licences must have similar flexibility to ensure water gets to important environmental assets and is able to meet the cultural needs of First Nations people.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: As long as the needs of the environment are genuinely not compromised.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report, Floodplain harvesting measurement, Modelling

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: RAMSAR wetlands are in decline and historic mismanagement of unique inland floodplains an identified reason for this decline. I am not convinced that bringing FPH within a licensing system will arrest this degradation unless overallocation and unsustainable land use is also properly addressed. I am not convinced of your data and modelling as I cannot find where there has been genuine independent review. Rainfall runoff exemption demonstrates the preferential approach by government and its agencies to NSW water management - this bias was identified by ICAC. State/Commonwealth water laws prioritise protection of the environment but govt

policy does not reflect this. For First Nations people their water access rights must be protected whether within the Gwydir catchment or for downstream users.

Submission 34

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community group

3. Where are you located? Coastal region

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: No comment

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. Please explain your rationale: Delivers potential for harvesting of greater volume than is ecologically sustainable

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: straightforward BUT add proviso that this does not mean support for greater volume of water harvesting, either on an average OR. per event, than is ecologically sustainable and taking into account predicted increase of climate change impacts.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: Essential in light of still to be resolved uncertainties and in keeping with precautionary principle

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trading of water derived from a placed based rainfall event is anomalous; defining zones within the valley at least goes part way to at least acknowledging this is a step in the right. direction: I would prefer a special NO trading rule to be invoked for floodplain harvesting.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Active Management is essential to deliver the flexibility needed to adjust from the current largely unauthorised practices and to ensure 'take' under entitlements are determined at sustainable levels,

accountable and equitable without being subject to compensation. See also previous comment.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: I acknowledge that the practice of floodplain harvesting exists albeit largely without formal legal status, such that I accept amendments are needed to address this situation. However if the objectives and principles of the Water Act, and aspirations to maintain a healthy working river are to be met, wind back of existing fph is essential: the amendments need to be tweaked accordingly.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Delivers potential for harvesting of greater volume than is ecologically sustainable

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: straightforward BUT add proviso that this does not mean support for greater volume of water harvesting.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Essential in light of still to be resolved uncertainties and in keeping with precautionary principle

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: HOWEVER I consider trading of water derived from a placed based rainfall event is anomalous; defining zones within the valley at least goes part way to at least acknowledging this is a step in the right direction: I would prefer a special NO trading rule to be invoked for floodplain harvesting.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: I acknowledge that the practice of floodplain harvesting exists albeit largely without formal legal status, such that I accept amendments are needed to address this situation. However if the objectives and principles of the Water Act, and aspirations to maintain a healthy working river are to be met, wind back of existing fph is essential: the amendments need to be tweaked accordingly

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: The mismatch between claimed aspirations to deliver a healthy working river and in practice roll-out of needed water reform has been highlighted in a number of recent reports at state and national level. The decline of the Gwydir Wetlands, a key environmental asset, exemplifies many of the problems. A whole of catchment strategy, that provides an ecologically sustainable framework for surface and underground water system management, is needed to underpin natural resource management, of which

individual water sharing and water resource plans and rules are subset. It is understood that efforts are being made to improve communication. Top down communication, mushroom treatment, and lack of impartiality are no longer acceptable. Many of us would like to be able to trust the government to get on with its job – sadly as yet there is still a way to go before such social licence will be granted.

Submission 35

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name: N/A

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: Loss of water loss of production loss of money loss of jobs weakens communities

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: River Systems are healthy and after the long drought it is important that irrigators get off to as much water as possible to catch up the large losses.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: No

9.1. Please explain your rationale: Would think that irrigation farmers are like all businesses they need assurances of water year by year.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Whilst I accept trade needs to be managed the proposed zones have other implications that have not been resolved. FPH access is measured at the storage which in some cases will be a different trading zone to the access point. Trade will be limited and the risk of concentration is minimal, but the burden of the trade zones and extra complications make it unnecessary

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: The rules provide certainty, active management is too slow to react with not enough data.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: We are sick of being the political football. Businesses need rules based on facts that provide certainty. We can deal with climate variability if we are treated fairly.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: This restricts access in successive wet years when impact is very low.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

16. Please explain your rationale: Initial AWD should reflect recent access to FPH. If access has been high in the 5 years leading up to licensing this should be reflected in the initial AWD. If access has been low in the 5 years before, which it has been to date, this should be reflected in the initial AWD.

17. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: The rules provide certainty, active management is too slow to react with not enough data.

18. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: I believe trades should be individually assessed, zones create lines and restrictions that don't always make sense.

19. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

19.1. Please explain your rationale: We are sick of being the political football. Businesses need rules based on facts that provide certainty. We can deal with climate variability if we are treated fairly.

20. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Floodplain harvesting measurement

21. Your feedback:

21.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Timelines for delivery of measurement are unachievable. Department need to acknowledge that industry is willing to measure but the timelines cannot be met.

Submission 36

1. **Who are you representing?**
 - 1.1. **Name:** N/A
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:**
4. **Attended Gwydir public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** No comment
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No comment
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
8. **Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences:** No comment
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No comment
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** No comment
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No comment
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No comment
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** No comment
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
14. **Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)?** No comment
 - 14.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
15. **What initial Available Water Determination would you support?** No comment

15.1. Please explain your rationale:

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No comment

16.1. Please explain your rationale:

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No comment

17.1. Please explain your rationale:

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No comment

18.1. Please explain your rationale:

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 37

1. **Who are you representing?**
 - 1.1. **Name:** Bruce Wilson
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Brewarrina 2839 N.S.W.
4. **Attended Gwydir public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
8. **Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences:** 1 ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
14. **Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)?** No
 - 14.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
15. **What initial Available Water Determination would you support?** 1 ML per unit share
 - 15.1. **Please explain your rationale:**

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale:

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale:

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale:

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: F.P.H. rules must restrict access until end of system flow targets are met. Flood flows must reach Barwon Darling System before any F.P.H. in Gwydir Valley

Submission 38

1. **Who are you representing?**
 - 1.1. **Name:**
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Irritek Pty Ltd
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:**
4. **Attended Gwydir public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** No comment
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No comment
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
8. **Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences:** More than 1 ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Setting the initial available water determination at 5ML per unit share would assist irrigators in adapting to the new regulatory framework and would be a pragmatic approach to ensure compliance from the outset.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No comment
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No comment
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No comment
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** No comment
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
14. **Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)?** No comment

14.1. Please explain your rationale:

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Setting the initial available water determination at 5ML per unit share would assist irrigators in adapting to the new regulatory framework and would be a pragmatic approach to ensure compliance from the outset.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No comment

16.1. Please explain your rationale:

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No comment

17.1. Please explain your rationale:

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No comment

18.1. Please explain your rationale:

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report, Modelling, Predicted environmental outcomes, Report to assist community consultation

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Irritek is concerned about potential economic and social impacts on the community as a result of the proposed Floodplain harvesting licence rules. Irritek makes the following submissions:

That the potential economic and social costs to the community as a result of the Floodplain harvesting licence rules is disproportionate to the negligible impact of the rules downstream, and that the economic cost and other impacts to irrigators will have a negative flow on effect to social investment in Moree.

That the economic cost and other impacts to irrigators will have a negative flow on effect to local small business.

That the economic cost to the community from the Floodplain harvesting licence rules should be reduced by investment into the Gwydir Wetlands to develop tourism.

That the initial available water determination should be set at 5ML per unit share.

Submission 39

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** The Armidale Branch of the National Parks Association of NSW

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Environmental group

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. **If other, please specify:** Our group has members across the Northern Tablelands on both sides of the Great Dividing range including members in the Gwydir catchment.

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Water Management Act says you have to meet environmental needs as top priority so you need flexibility to do this. The downstream environments have been missing out on needed flood flows for decades. The Barwon and Darling will continue to miss out on flows from the dammed catchments until the dams have filled. You need maximum flexibility to learn how to manage FPH in this context not just in the context of the irrigators having to manage with entitlements that are less than they used to take. If there are good floods in the first few years of the rules, irrigators should not be able to grow their FPH: it is your job to ensure they don't. You should add a line to the table about theoretical growth opportunities that includes the theoretical possibility that you succeed in doing your jobs, implementing the WMA priorities and have 0% growth: be positive - you can do it! There are so many people in the community including many irrigators who accept that the environment and downstream communities need your department to take a stronger stand and to learn how to do adaptive management well. This FPH management process is the best opportunity available to make big improvements in water management..

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Repeated floods are needed now by the wetland plants, birds, frogs, by the trees on the floodplain, and by the Barwon that has again stopped flowing. If the FPH entitlement is higher than 1ML the environment is likely to miss out on more water from the first floods after the rules come in, just when the environment needs it most after the horrific drought. The

environment has missed some of its government-determined theoretical share since the growth above 1994 cap started.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: This is the essential way to improve management in relation to actual circumstances being experienced, including broad environmental circumstances, social circumstances and as additional knowledge, understanding, modelling refinements, etc become available. This is how people can work together to improve multi-objective outcomes.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. Please explain your rationale: They enable some limit on opportunities to increase impacts on the wetlands in the Gingham and Lower Gwydir, while enabling some change over time within the zones via trading.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Active management is essential. Members of our organisation have been dismayed for decades by the inadequate protection of environmental water. All water that is defined at some point as environmental water should be protected to benefit the environment until it evaporates along its natural route or at least until it is absorbed by the soil. NSW Government defined environmental water as including all the water that wasn't allocated to other uses then allowed increasing amounts to be taken by uncontrolled FPH. The reduction in FPH needs to be done in a way that not only enables the environment generally to get a bit more for a short time but involves choosing where take has to be decreased and ensuring that the water is not then taken for another consumptive use, such as by irrigators in the Darling or further down a Gwydir unregulated stream.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: This a first attempt at substantial management of floodplain harvesting - there will be a lot learnt from how it works and how it could be done better. The potential for amendment has potential to benefit all interests. We are appalled that, as part of this first substantial FPH regulatory system, our Government proposes to not only hand out permanent, compensatable rights to water that was previously taken without a right, but is also considering not including amendment provisions such that we, the tax payers would have to pay compensation for any improvements later found necessary to those who have already had so much free water at the expense of people and the environments downstream

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: FPH rules should be designed to fit environmental needs (ideally only permitted when least needed by the environment) not designed to match rules for accounting for take from in-channel flows. Manage floodplain flows and accounting for take each year as it comes in both regulated and unregulated parts of the floodplain - most parts get floods primarily from the Gwydir and its tributaries so all should be on an annual basis, not some on a different basis which could be inequitable.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Same as question 9

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: same as 13.1. The rules should enable 'Active management' on an event basis throughout the floodplain system as well as throughout the river system. This could benefit environments in the lower parts of the floodplain near unregulated streams if particular environmental assets were identified as needing flows.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Constraints on trading are needed to limit risks of excessive trade moving impacts to the detriment of an environment. Use of existing zones is better than no zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: Same as 14.1

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: We welcome regulation of FPH but this proposal does not restrict take enough and should not produce compensable rights. FPH should be limited to about the 79 GL in the 2004 WSP. All works including for harvesting rainfall runoff should require works approval. Only 10% of runoff should be excluded. Environment should get 500% of its average share before FPH rules start. Never allow FPH unless downstream targets are met.

Submission 40

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Environmental group

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. **If other, please specify:** Mudgee

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: No comment

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** These rules increase access to water over time, essentially another form of the 500% carryover rule.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Licensed access should be no larger than 1ML , to allow essential flood flow to flood dependent areas and communities downstream.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** To accurately measure how much water is taken from flood flows, metering is essential.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Areas of environmental and cultural importance must be protected from excessive water harvesting.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The Basin Plan specifies that Held Environmental Water is protected from extraction.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** FPH rules on water sharing plans must be flexible to avoid unnecessary compensation payouts.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: To maintain consistency of rules across all river systems in the Gwydir, access to FPH in unregulated rivers should be restricted to the same access rules.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Licensed access should be no larger than 1ML to allow essential volume to flow to flood dependent areas and communities downstream.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Held Environmental Water is protected from extraction under the Basin Plan.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Areas of important environmental and cultural value must be protected from the effect of increased water extraction.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: FPH rules relating to water sharing plans must be able to be modified to avoid compensation payouts.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: It is essential that rules applying to FPH upstream of the Barwon-Darling allow flood flows to meet system flow targets.

Submission 41

1. **Who are you representing?**
 - 1.1. **Name:** N/A
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Sydney
4. **Attended Gwydir public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This option gives higher access to water over time, inappropriate given projected water supplies
8. **Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences:** 1 ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not grow.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Until FPH is metered there is no accurate understanding of the volumes of water being taken from flood flows
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Areas of high environmental and cultural value must be protected from increased water extraction.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is a requirement of the Basin Plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** FPH rules must be subject to change without a cost to public money.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Access to FPH in unregulated rivers should be consistently restricted to annual access rules

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: It is a requirement of the Basin Plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 42

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** Sustainable Living Armidale

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Environmental group

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** the principles of intergenerational equity require that management rules be flexible, especially given the current conditions of great climate variability. To allow such significant 'carryover' can only be to the detriment of the environment.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Initial access to licensed entitlement must be set at 1ML unit share to ensure equitable access to the flood events which are essential to drought recovery for flood-dependent ecosystems, groundwater recharge, aquifers and downstream communities.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Until FPH is metered there is no accurate understanding of the volumes of water being taken from flood flows. Contemporary flood events must be accurately factored into decision making- modelling based on events prior to 2009 is simply inadequate.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale** given that trading is a requirement the very least that can be done to protect areas of high environmental and community value is to prevent trading between zones.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: In the context of the current Climate Emergency Active Management is essential to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Amendments to protect environmental flows must be facilitated and there must be an ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Access to FPH on unregulated rivers should be restricted to annual access for consistency across the catchment and in response to the climate variability currently being experienced

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Initial access to licensed entitlement must be set at 1ML unit share to ensure equitable access to flood the events which are essential to drought recovery for flood-dependent ecosystems, groundwater recharge, aquifers and downstream communities.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: In the context of the current Climate Emergency, Active Management it is essential to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: areas of high environmental and community heritage value must be protected from increased water extraction.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: Amendments to protect environmental flows must be facilitated and there must be an ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Climate change must be foregrounded and end of system flow targets established before allocations in the upper reaches of the catchment can be properly considered. Reliance on modelling based on events prior to 2009 is unconscionable; DPIE assurances are

unsupported; the future of the RAMSAR listed wetlands of the Gwydir River looks bleak.

Submission 43

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** Healthy Rivers Dubbo (HRD)

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Environmental group

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Climate models used are limited to 2009 climate records. They look backwards at past flood patterns, which were smaller, relatively frequent events. Climate models looking forward show there will be larger, less frequent floods in the future. One year accounting with no "carry over" will mean volumes of take will be limited to one years' entitlement. Five year accounting with carryover up to 500% would mean a very large portion of a large flood event could be harvested. Five year accounting with carryover is not acceptable given a future with larger less frequent flood events, as it would give higher access to water over time.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Any more than 1 ML unit share is an unacceptable free kick to the irrigation industry. Industry has enjoyed free unmeasured FPH take considerably over the 1994 cap for decades, while First Nations Communities and the Environment have been denied access to flows. Flood events usually end a drought, when rivers, wetlands, aquifers, floodplains and downstream communities are in critical need of water.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Healthy Rivers Dubbo believes it is critical that end of system targets be met before FPH take is allowed. The lack of measurement of take for use as historic data of FPH take is a huge problem, as identified in the independent review of the modelling. Until metering is in place the volumes being taken will not be accurately known. An Adaptive AWD is the best way to control FPH take so it is under the cap, and end of system targets are met.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. Please explain your rationale: HRD does not support trading of FPH licences, but acknowledges trading water entitlements is a fact of the Basin Plan. We support only the permanent trade of FPH licences. HRD supports restricting trade of FPH licences into floodplain management zones A & D to protect important environmental assets like the Gwydir wetlands.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Held and Planned environmental water must be protected from extraction. HRD strongly objects to an amendment of the Gwydir Surface Water Resource Plan that would not protect PEW from FPH diversion.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The water sharing plan rules must be able to be changed to ensure that any adjustments to entitlements once issued do not attract compensation.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: HRD supports 1 year account management with no so-called 'carry over'. The use of the term carry over should only apply to water that is in water users accounts and is being kept in storage for use in a following year. This proposed rule makes it so that the river owes irrigation water that isn't yet present. That this concept was even proposed is a clear sign that DPIE continues to favour irrigation over the environment, as per the findings of the recent NSW ICAC investigation into NSW water management.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: To offer any more than 1 ML per share as an initial AWD to an industry that has had free unlimited access to floodwaters and rainfall run off for decades (well over capped levels) - while First Nation communities, downstream communities and the environment have had to suffer significant consequences of this unrestrained take - is undefendable.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Held and Planned environmental water must be protected from extraction. HRD strongly objects to an amendment of the Gwydir Surface Water Resource Plan that do not protect PEW from FPH diversion.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be mechanisms to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The water sharing plan rules must be able to be changed to ensure that any adjustments to entitlements once issued do not attract compensation.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling, Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: The Model Rebuild report is not fit for purpose, it has serious data deficiencies. Lack of reliable records, uncertainty around rainfall run off volumes - up to +-25% uncertainty. No confidence.

Rainfall Runoff Exemption - HRD strongly objects to allowing unlicensed capture of rainfall runoff. All take over the 10% harvestable right must be licenced and account towards the cap.

The 1994 accredited cap reports will need to be public before we have confidence in FPH.

Submission 44

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** Environmentally Concerned Citizens of Orange Inc.

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Environmental group

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. **If other, please specify:** Macquarie catchment, Central West

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: No comment

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Another form of the 500% carryover rule and gives higher access to water over time.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery , especially for flood dependent ecosystems, downstream communities, and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Until FPH is metered there is no accurate understanding of of the volumes of water being taken from flood flows.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is a requirement of the basin plan to protect Held Environmental water from extraction.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be the ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Access to FPH in unregulated rivers should be restricted to annual access rules to maintain consistency with rules across all river systems in the Gwydir catchment.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and underground aquifer recharge. Initial access to water entitlements should not be a larger volume.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: It is a requirement of the basin plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: It is important to protect levels of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be the ability to change the FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 45

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** Inland Rivers Network

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Environmental group

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. **If other, please specify:** Multiple locations

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

Proposed water sharing plan rules for floodplain harvesting in the Gwydir regulated river water source

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Please refer to separate detailed Submission #7.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Please refer to separate detailed Submission #7.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Support adaptive management rules to ensure that FPH is within Plan limit

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: No comment

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Support the prohibition of permanent trade into areas with sensitive environmental and cultural values

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Support the protection of Held Environmental Water releases under active management rules.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Support amendment provisions to enable adaptive management.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: One year account management with no carryover.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Please refer to separate detailed Submission #07.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Please refer to separate detailed Submission #07.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Support the prohibition of permanent trade into areas with sensitive environmental and cultural values.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: Support amendment provisions to enable active management.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 46

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Environmental group

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Floods occur in the Gwydir on average every 5 years. This rule allows for the maximum capture of floodwaters.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** To protect part of the first flood flow that occurs after FPH licences are granted. Much of the Northern Basin is still in drought. For similar reasons that Border Rivers will have a 1ML initial AWD and to maintain consistency across valleys with access to FPH

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** To allow for change once the full scale of FPH is understood after metering is in place.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The Gwydir Valley contains significant environmental and cultural values that must be protected from loss of critical flood flows

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The agreement under the Nth Basin Review and toolkit measures is to protect Held and Planned Environmental Water.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: These allow for changes to FPH rules in water sharing plans without triggering compensation

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: FPH should be managed through annual accounting rules across all water sources to maintain consistency

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: To protect part of the first flood flow that occurs after FPH licences are granted. Much of the Northern Basin is still in drought. For similar reasons that Border Rivers will have a 1ML initial AWD and to maintain consistency across all water sources and valleys with access to FPH

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: The agreement under the Nth Basin Review and toolkit measures is to protect Held and Planned Environmental Water.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: To prevent increased volumes of FPH in environmentally & culturally sensitive areas

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: These allow for changes to FPH rules in water sharing plans without triggering compensation

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Please refer to separate detailed Submission #03.

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 47

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** Knitting Nannas New England North West

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Environmental group

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Intergenerational Equity. With climate change rainfall is predicted to decrease. To continue using old data to allow the carryover rule giving farmers access to flood waters will destroy the Gwyder Wetlands and Murrey Darling River Systems

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** For the health of the river, ecosystems and ground water recharge it is essential that the floodwaters flow freely to the lower Gwyder, wetlands and on to the Murrey Darling River System.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Without water meters there is no measurement of the water being diverted to private dams

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This helps to protect areas of high environmental value and increase river flows.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** To protect environmental flows.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** To allow the management of water in the best interest of the community and environment.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Harvesting water in unregulated rivers is likely to be theft. All water usage should be measured and paid for annually.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Flood events are critical to the health of the river system. sometimes this is the only water that reaches down stream communities.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: It is an important clause in the Basin Plan to prevent the commercial use of Held Environmental Water.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: This replication will enable the protection of environmental and community flows.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: This will allow the change of FPH rules as required to monitor all water usage in a fair and equitable way, and charge for water accordingly. accordingly

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Predicted environmental outcomes

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Climate change is now impacting on our river systems. The climate modelling used for FPH ends on the year 2009. In the last 15 years there is significant changes in Australia's climate, less rain, hotter temperatures. Using data from the last 10 years is much more accurate. In all water plans, including Gwyder climate change must be factored into the plan

Submission 48

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Environmental group

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This is another form of the 500% carryover rule and permits excessive extractions and diversions from struggling river systems which are prevent flood waters restoring whole of river connectivity

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Until FPH is metered there is no accurate understanding of the volumes of water being taken from flood flows

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** REDACTED oppose the privatisation of water and seek the curbing of the damage caused to river systems and First Nations Water Rights by the commodification of water

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is a requirement of the Basin Plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Access to FPH in unregulated rivers should be restricted to annual access rules to maintain consistency with rules across all river systems in the Gwydir.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: It is a requirement of the Basin Plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Report to assist community consultation

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Rules must restrict FPH access until end of system flow targets are met, to ensure that flood flows reach the Barwon-Darling before FPH commences upstream.

Submission 49

1. **Who are you representing?**
 - 1.1. **Name:** N/A
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Sydney
4. **Attended Gwydir public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
8. **Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
14. **Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)?** No
 - 14.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
15. **What initial Available Water Determination would you support?** 1ML per unit share
 - 15.1. **Please explain your rationale:**

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale:

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale:

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale:

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report, Modelling, Predicted environmental outcomes

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Rules must restrict FPH access until within-valley and end of system flow targets are met, to ensure that flood flows satisfy priority of use obligations before FPH commences upstream.

Submission 50

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? First Nation

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. **If other, please specify:** Gwydir/Moree

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** if this means better flows back to rivers i support the proposed 5 years account management rule and modelling.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Because unsure of floods events these days

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: No

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I would like a consistant system whic doesnt take to much water

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: No

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** need to keep more water in rivers

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** limits water take by irrigators

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** get more water back to the river system

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? Yes

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I am hoping from a first nation view that it will get more water back to the rivers and billabongs for first nations people

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: river system at the moment is fragile and we dont need any further over allocation

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: river system at the moment is fragile and we dont need any further over allocation

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: river system at the moment is fragile and we dont need any further over allocation

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: to return water back to the river system and sustain better how water is managed.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Report to assist community consultation

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Better communication in regards in to the organization of first nation consultation meetings in Moree, not enough people were able to attend this round of consultation to capture all the views of first nation people in our community, recommend further consultation.

Submission 51

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** Alexander Gillon

1.2. **Organisation name:**

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? First Nation

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. **If other, please specify:** Gwydir/Moree

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: No

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** to make that they only take the legal limit

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** i reckon the best method is to only take there limit in only one year

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** i support changes as long as it benefits the first nation people and hte river system.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** to ensure we get a better system in water management to benefit our people

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** again to support the river system and first nation people that rely on the river

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** get more water back to the river system

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? Yes

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I am hoping from a first nation view that it will get more water back to the rivers and billabongs for first nations people

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: i believe this is the best method for the river

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: river system at the moment is in bad shape and we don't need any further over allocation.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: river system at the moment is fragile and we don't need any further over allocation of water

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale:

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: I would support rules that may benefit first nation people, we want water management to establish appropriate flows back in the Gwydir and Mehi that will allow the people of the Gwydir to all cultural activities that enjoy when has appropriate water. the system needs to be able to have back water flows to cat fish, we also need representatives that live in the local area.

Submission 52

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? First Nation

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** They allow excessive take of water from the floodplain

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There was no option to propose less. We don't support floodplain harvesting

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: No

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is not adaptive management by any proper definition, and we don't have a good understanding of how it will work

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Trading of floodplain harvesting licences is not supported. We don't see water as a tradeable commodity. It will increase the damage caused by extractions.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The information we need has not been provided in a way that is useful to us, and we do not trust this process

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: It is an act of bad faith to gazette a regulation and propose other regulations during a period of public submissions, when those regulations make significant changes to the floodplain harvesting policy

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: It allows excessive take from the floodplain

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? No comment

15.1. Please explain your rationale:

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No comment

16.1. Please explain your rationale:

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trading of floodplain harvesting licences is not supported

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: It is an act of bad faith to gazette a regulation and propose other regulations during a period of public submissions, when those regulations make significant changes to the floodplain harvesting policy

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: The information is very difficult to follow and is not designed for use by ordinary community members

Submission 53

1. **Who are you representing?**
 - 1.1. **Name:** N/A
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Brewarrina Shire Council
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Local council
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:**
4. **Attended Gwydir public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** No comment
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No comment
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
8. **Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences:** No comment
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No comment
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** No comment
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No comment
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No comment
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** No comment
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
14. **Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)?** No
 - 14.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Do not support the licensing of captured water from flood flows, the issue of licenses for structures to divert flood waters into storage and the trading of floodplain water licenses away from property where

diversion has been constructed and the accumulation of water access rights because of dry periods.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? No comment

15.1. Please explain your rationale:

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No comment

16.1. Please explain your rationale:

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No comment

17.1. Please explain your rationale:

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: No measures of flood plain harvesting impacts, no linkages between the property where diversionary structures are constructed and licenses being issued and then traded away from that property / location.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Floodplain harvesting measurement

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Please refer to separate detailed Submission #02.

Submission 54

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** N/A

1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Modelling, Peer review

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I Support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government & must be rectified.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. if there is water that should be available to the industry then governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. our communities demands it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There was no evidence of impact that this would have on long -term. the impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted & on the valley compliance limit, has not being determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed .

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering & reporting of all water take.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share.

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government & must be rectified.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: There is no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not being determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: The Trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them " subject to further changes". They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. "

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Floodplain harvesting measurement

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: 5 years account is the most equitable for stake holders, as it gives you opportunity to catch up on years of no water harvesting .

Submission 55

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The fact these rules only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is being implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. Its important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: If environmental water holder decide they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those

individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately

implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 56

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The fact these rules only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is being implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. Its important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: If environmental water holder decide they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those

individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately

implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 57

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The fact these rules only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is being implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. Its important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: If environmental water holder decide they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those

individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately

implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 58

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The fact these rules only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is being implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. Its important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: If environmental water holder decide they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those

individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately

implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Please value my Submission as I don't want my community to be further diminished

Submission 59

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The fact these rules only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is being implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. Its important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: If environmental water holder decide they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those

individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately

implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: The report is flawed with the assumption that non harvested water returns to the floodplain. the report suggests that there will be a 22% increase in end of system flows. at the meeting in Moree on Feb 25 Dan Connor admitted that the extra flow maybe 3%

Submission 60

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The REDACTED did not find that the Department provided an appropriate level of detail to have an informed decision around different accounting approaches. They provided evidence to support the proposed 5-year option but could not provide or confirm our own estimates of shares, that could be proposed for a three-year accounting rules. With this in mind, we have found it challenging to undertake due process and diligence on behalf of our members. As a result, all we can do, as part of this process, is support in-principal rules which ensure future access of floodplain and overland flows remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems - which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, therefore having opportunity to accrue account water for when a flood occurs, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times, but ensures overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. Issuing shares as proposed at 108,000 unit shares and allowing these to be managed over a 5-year accounting period with a maximum account limit of five times unit shares, allows a theoretical maximum take in a flood of 540,000ML. That is theoretical because every individual licence holder would need to carryover all of their allocation for the full five years to have it available for access and would mean a flood on the scale of 2011 and 2012 would be needed to trigger than access. It's important to note that this new compliant volume maximum account limit is 28% lower than the most recent highest volume of 759,000ML in 2000 meaning there will be more water to top up even the largest of floods if they occur. If alternative approaches outside that proposed in the compliance scenario, which included 5-year accounting sequences with a maximum account limit of five times unit shares are considered by government, then they must be modelled in terms of benefits and impacts. The environmental, legislative and social and

economic considerations should all be included but this has not been done. This is demonstrated by our analysis below, which highlights the risk to reliant industries and communities of not aligning accounting rules with the intent of the program to licence the historical formal of take within legally defined limits, no more or no less. For example modelled unrestricted floodplain harvesting over the last 10 years was compared with different accounting strategies of annual accounting using long-term average shares and 5 year accounting with long-term average shares. The outcome indicated that the annual accounting approach that incorrectly assumes long-term shares results in an additional impact of \$1.2B due to extreme restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is much less at \$300M with average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year, which is below the long-term compliance target of 93,200ML/year. The issue is that by applying long-term thinking in a short-term approach, this reform can easily move away from being a licence and compliance reform and becomes environmental recovery by stealth. The accounting framework should focus on ensuring legal limits, rather than driving overall water use below these legal limits which is clearly demonstrated by the above scenario. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg)

licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: Given the very limited opportunities for overland flows have occurred over most of the past two decades, these conditions alone should support an initialisation that is representative of the maximum allowable account limit. This is required to ensure that the community has an opportunity to recover from drought. However, an equitable process, is that Department determine what could be modelled to be available in accounts assuming that this compliance approach was initiated in either 2011 or 2012, the last time accounts would have been fully utilised. This process reflects what access may have been available and adjusts the water available under the licencing program for this water access, to ensure ongoing take can also be within compliant levels of take. It acts to provide a transitional arrangement that matches the long-term outcomes of the legal limits with the seasonal and valley-scale variation in access. The alternative as recommended in the Border Rivers, applies short-term strategies to long-term policy and provide a blunt, restriction at the beginning of the new licencing arrangement resulting in the immediate reduction in water being far greater than the long-term requirements, which will result in impacts far greater and more broad ranging than those estimated by just achieving compliant levels of take. The concern is that if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012, and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put the region into a government

enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliant legal limits on take and will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) it will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows, at the required long-term volume. The REDACTED also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements, whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits are not achieved. The recommended approach is consistent with initialisation during those reforms whereby it was recognised that a transitional approach was required to step into the new licencing framework and avoid unnecessary negative impacts by sudden water user behaviour responses. Recommendation: Transitional account management rules are enabled that pre-determine via modelling what water could available in accounts if the floodplain harvesting licencing and compliance approach was initiated in either 2011 or 2012, the last time accounts would have been fully utilised. This approach aligns the long-term objectives of the policy and ensure that the overall impact of the reform is not greater than that required to achieve compliant legal limits without detracting from environmental or floodplain flows.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: The REDACTED support allowing available water determinations to be varied to ensure take remains within limits, but particularly if metering and monitoring data reveal the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. It is important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available then governments have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach. Recommendation: Available water determinations should be enabled to be varied to ensure take remains within limits, governments must take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade allows a clearly defined market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses into the future. The benefits of a trading framework are also broad-ranging, the range of market participants that can now be involved. There are opportunities for a range of new water users, particularly the expansion of environmental water holders into this form of take in NSW as part of a trading framework which should also be recognised. While the REDACTED support a trading framework we have concerns with the zones proposed to be implemented. We agree that we must prevent growth in sensitive areas which can be clearly outlined by mandatory restrictions on new works in the Floodplain Management Zones A and D as proposed. But the establishment of broad sub-catchment trade zones as proposed provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. For example, this establishment of sub-catchment boundaries, may result in only a limited number of catchments having trade as an opportunity to offset the compliance restrictions which are socialised across the valley. This would restrict the potential market price but also be inequitable for water users in other zones, that have also had the same reduction in water availability, but they have no willing sellers in their sub-catchment. The proposals seem also impractical to implement given they provide artificial barriers which do not reflect farm boundaries or operations. This is evident by the inability for the Department to explain how a water user who crosses multiple trade boundaries could operate, given one licence volume is proposed to be issued and which zone they could seek trades from within. Removing of the proposed trade zones will also ensure greater consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Rather we recommend that willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level of long-term take and a trading market in this manner provides a defined mechanism with equitable, market base outcomes. Instead of sub-catchment limits to entitlements, we proposed individual limits which equal the current long-term take as defined as maximum number of shares. Individuals are free to trade up to these limits freely within anywhere within the floodplain. This allows some water users to manage their take back to these historical limits, whilst reducing access elsewhere. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones. The sub-catchment zones also appear to be impractical to implement given that they do not reflect farm layouts or farm management, applying an artificial barrier. This is evident by the inability for the Department to explain how a water user who crosses multiple trade boundaries could operate, given one licence volume is proposed to be issued and which zone they could seek trades from within, and if they can move water across the zones. We recommend that applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, should be considered to be subject to a more detailed assessment, which could assess downstream flows and environmental impacts. Given infrastructure limitations, we support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage. The perceived risks associated with trade are mitigated by a strong and robust measurement and compliance program, which we believe has

been proposed and currently being implemented. Recommendation: An open and transparent trading framework must be enabled immediately upon licencing to allow impacted water users and dependent communities the opportunity to mitigate the impact of reduced water availability due to the compliance and licencing reform as well as, provide new opportunities to maximise environmental outcomes by environmental water managers.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Recommendation: Acknowledge there is limited information to measure and monitor flows to implement a fair and equitable active management approach for floodplain harvesting and that the impacts of this policy have not been assessed against long-term compliance and impacts to those water users. The REDACTED do not support this as a policy at this point in time, but rather recommend it is included as a possible amendment provision pending further work. We also continue to have concerns around the accuracy of estimation of active environmental water and the timeliness of announcements to water users, given the distance between the point of access and their trigger measurement point. These concerns have seen significant impacts in other valleys, predominately the Barwon Darling where very conservative modelling extended restrictions beyond what was reasonable. Key to this is that the approach and implementation of active management to date does not indicate that there are systems and measures in place to effectively implement these rules without undue impacts on water users. Active management of floodplain and overland flows adds yet another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. We must acknowledge there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, there is limited gauging network and no floodplain measurement in these areas to monitor flows. Localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken. We therefore cannot support the broad application of Active Management to this resource until safeguards are established that protect water users in times of sudden flood situation.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Recommendation: The process of enabling an amendment is outlined to ensure consultation and engagement with affected communities. Amendment provisions for access rules must acknowledge the limitations in monitoring, measuring and forecasting floodplain flows. Recommendation: An amendment provision to allow for the recalibration of the

model with metering data collected from licencing within the first five years or after a flood is recommended.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? Yes

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Floodplain harvesting and overland flows occur similarly regardless of their location on a regulated or unregulated section of the Gwydir Valley Floodplain. Therefore, there is no argument to support why accounting framework for this form of access is different in the unregulated to the regulated system. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be encouraged. With that in mind, as for the regulated water sharing plan submission, the REDACTED can support in-principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling. This way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential licencing and compliance reform. Although achieving compliance has environmental benefits. We therefore, recommend consideration is given to matching accounting frameworks between unregulated and regulated floodplain harvesting licences. Or if this is not possible, that this issue is included as part of the upcoming unregulated water sharing plan review and actual metering data is used to inform that discussion into the future. Recommendation: Consistency between entitlements in the regulated and unregulated water sharing plans is supported.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: As with the regulated water sharing plan, given the very limited opportunities for overland flows have occurred over most of the past two decades, these conditions alone should support an initialisation that is representative of the maximum allowable account limit. This is required to ensure that the community has an opportunity to recover from drought. As there is no modelled approach for unregulated water users, the most equitable process, is to apply a starting balance that matches the unregulated water availability at the valley-scale. This process reflects what access may have been available and adjust the water available under the licencing program for this water access, to ensure ongoing take can also be within compliant levels of take. It acts to provide a transitional arrangement that matches the long-term outcomes of the legal limits with the seasonal and valley-scale variation in access. The alternative as recommended in the Border Rivers, applies short-term strategies to long-term policy and provide a blunt, restriction at the beginning of the new licencing

arrangement resulting in the immediate reduction in water being far greater than the long-term requirements. This ultimately results in impacts far greater and more broad ranging than those estimated by just achieving compliant levels of take. The concern is that if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access the long-term volume will be missed. As noted earlier, the recommended approach is consistent with initialisation during those reforms whereby it was recognised that a transitional approach was required to step into the new licencing framework and avoid unnecessary negative impacts by sudden water user behaviour responses. Recommendation: Transitional account management rules are enabled that pre-determine what could be available in accounts if the floodplain harvesting licencing and compliance approach was initiated earlier. This approach aligns the long-term objectives of the policy and ensure that the overall impact of the reform is not greater than that required to achieve compliant legal limits without detracting from environmental or floodplain flows.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: As with the regulated water sharing plan comments, one clear objective of the Active Management policy is to provide certainty to all water users; irrigators and the environment, around protecting their historical access to water. With that in mind, the REDACTED supports clear rules that provide this clarity around usage and delivery of held environmental in some sections of the valley, when it can be clearly demonstrated that this water is additional to the system, is required. The message from the affected members was that they have no intention to access environmental water and it is the Departments or environmental water managers role to clearly identify this portion of the flow when it occurs. We appreciate the importance of this Policy to provide a consistent approach. However, as we stated throughout the Active Management consultation process even through the Gingham, Lower Gwydir and Mallowa water sources are historically targeted for environmental releases, the overall risk to held environmental water deliveries above what has historically always occurred (prior to the Basin Plan) is minor given the natural constraints on delivery, small volume of extraction licences and the construct of the current unregulated water sharing plan commence to pump thresholds. We welcomed the NSW Government's recognition of this low risk, particularly in the removal of the Gwydir Water Source as a targeted area within the policy at the time. We also continue to have concerns around the accuracy of estimation of active environmental water and the timeliness of announcements to water users, given the distance between the point of access and their trigger measurement point. These concerns have seen significant impacts in other valleys, predominately the Barwon Darling where very conservative modelling extended restrictions beyond what was reasonable. Key to this is that the approach and implementation of active management to date does not indicate that there are systems and measures in place to effectively implement these rules without undue impacts on water users. Active management of floodplain and overland flows, adds yet another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. We must

acknowledge there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, there is limited gauging network and no floodplain measurement in these areas to monitor flows, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken. We therefore cannot support the broad application of Active Management to this resource until safeguards are established that protect water users in times of sudden flood situation. Recommendation: Acknowledge there is limited information to measure and monitor flows to implement a fair and equitable active management approach for floodplain harvesting and that the impacts of this policy have not been assessed against long-term compliance and impacts to those water users. The REDACTED do not support this as a policy at this point in time, but rather recommend it is included as a possible amendment provision pending further work.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade allows a clearly defined market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses into the future and allows. The benefits of a trading framework are also broad-ranging, given the range of market participants that can now be involved. There are opportunities for a range of new water users, particularly the expansion of environmental water holders into this form of take in NSW as part of a trading framework which should also be recognised. However, the existing trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and the REDACTED has repeatedly requested those to be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. As with the regulated water sharing plan feedback, any trades zone in this manner provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. The proposal also seems impractical to implement given they provide artificial barriers which do not reflect farm boundaries or operations. This is evident by the inability for the Department to explain how a water user who crosses multiple trade boundaries could operate, given one licence volume is proposed to be issued and which zone they could seek trades from within. Removing of the proposed trade zones will also ensure greater consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Recommendation: The trade zones within the unregulated water sharing plans are not adopted for the purposes of floodplain harvesting rather that the limitations of changes works within floodplain management zones A and D within the mandatory conditions provide the protection needed for sensitive areas. Recommendation: We recommended the unregulated water sharing plan zones

are reviewed as priority as part of the upcoming water sharing plan review scheduled.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: Recommendation: The process of enabling an amendment is outlined to ensure consultation and engagement with affected communities. Amendment provisions for access rules must acknowledge the limitations in monitoring, measuring and forecasting floodplain flows.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling, Other, Report to assist community consultation

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Given that the Gwydir IQQM is soon to be replaced with a new Gwydir Source Model, the Department needs to prepare for this and establish a clear process to inform and communicate key stakeholders about this rebuild. Stakeholders will need clarity that this new model will address the area for improvement required in the Gwydir IQQM. But they will also be interested in the development process of the new model and the Department should provide updates at key steps. To re-build a model then to collate this information at the end, in a model build report, will be overwhelming to document. Our recommendation is to bring stakeholders along with this improvement journey and provide, opportunity along the way to provide insight and improvements along that process.
Recommendation: The Department establish a clear process to inform and communicate outcomes of the building of the Gwydir Source Model to replace the Gwydir IQQM.

Submission 61

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. If other, please specify: Gwydir valley

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The fact these rules only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is being implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. Its important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

12. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community and/or If environmental water holder decide they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage

13. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is

limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

14. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

14.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

15. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry

certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

16. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

16.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

17. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may

be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

18. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

19. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

19.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

20. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other, Report to assist community consultation

21. Your feedback:

21.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: "We understand the Government has applied many resources to implement a compliance and licencing

reform system. Throughout this process it has highlighted that more consultation and work is needed to review the true social and economic factors that will be experienced in the communities in the northern basin.

As a water user I accept that legal limits must be recognised, but decisions have to consider the socio-economic impacts on community to achieve these limits. We know every \$1 lost at the farm gate will take a minimum of \$2.18 from our economy, it means less money to spend in shops and businesses, less jobs and less families and less services in our community. When people leave the bush they don't come back. Its already getting harder to get experienced qualified people to our town, if you limit our opportunity to capture flood water and use it in the dry times to ensure some resemblance of consistent income for our rural towns, they will die."

Submission 62

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The modelled data supports the idea that smaller entitlements coupled with potential 5 year carryover of allocation fits with the ephemeral nature of overland flows as we have experienced them in many years of land ownership in the Gwydir valley. In my mind the policy should allow access to overland flows in times of plenty and limit take in times of less, and I believe that the proposed 5 year account management rules will help achieve this outcome, for the benefit of all stakeholders.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Given the length of time it has taken to get the healthy floodplains project to this point, and considering the majority of irrigators have not had access to overland flows for 9 years, it seems appropriate to start accounting at a level which best fits how accounts would be if the policy was in place earlier, as irrigators would have banked carryover in the preceding 9 years of no floods. To start accounting with less than account limit would prolong the drought, should a flood event occur in the short term, causing extended hardship for not only those who lose production from lack of available water, but also the community and local businesses who rely on the irrigation industry to survive. With general security and supplementary allocation reliability in a downward trend already, to force further production limits through ill timed policy implementation would not see a desired outcome for any local stakeholders.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Yes, with robust and clearly defined trigger points and outcomes.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. Please explain your rationale: proposed trade zones make sense.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale:

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale:

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? Yes

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Maintains consistency with existing rules

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: As per 9.1 above.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: as per above

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: as per above

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale:

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 63

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. Please explain your rationale: Limits account overtime , can creat a median rather than average for all parties and to long a weather cycle.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: Utilises wet and dry cycles and expands community revenue from a variable resource.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: No comment

9.1. Please explain your rationale:

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: There will be an opportunity lost for users and the community to utilise all entitlements of an event.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be clear and definable rules for both environmental and water users. This also adds another layer of growing complexity. There is no correlation or evidence between the impacts that this would have long term.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: There has already been lack of confidence as we have started 75% of the SDL. 90GL instead of 120GL.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? Yes

14.1. Please explain your rationale: To reduce the “boom and bust” effect, which I turn should stabilise the community and industry.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Utilises wet and dry cycles and expands community revenue from a variable resource.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be clear and definable rules for both environmental and water users. This also adds another layer of growing complexity. There is no correlation or evidence between the impacts that this would have long term.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: There will be an opportunity lost for users and the community to utilise all entitlements of an event.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: There has already been lack of confidence as we have started 75% of the SDL. The effect on the community will be negative as it reduces possible incomes and the stability of the community. It is also too open to amendments by the government without conciliation to the effected community and users.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: With ECA management Gwydir wetlands are kept full in a closed system, therefore, proportioning more MBDA water flow down other streams that could have been kept within the community. Gwydir irrigator plains do not have run off of upstream terrain, therefore, restricting any irrigated run off making it into the river system, referring to runoff exemption. Within the model the cap figure of 120GL initially with now the current proposal of 90GL, this inconsistency is far from transparent and provokes uncertainty.

Submission 64

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Peer review

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale:

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact was transitioning to these water licenses has being ignored by government and must be rectified. Eg. 3 people are usually employed but after floods I increase this to match demand. In the local industry is forced to miss the next flooding opportunity. I will not have the increased demand and be able to employ the additional staff and be in extended drought

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: No comment

9.1. Please explain your rationale:

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Application to transfer entitlement above current conditions limit the require more detail assessment

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: There is no evidence of impact that this would have on the long term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and to the valley compliance limit has not being determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The community is never but at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Why support the licensing, metering and reporting of all water take

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with our rules but the community impact transiting to these licenses has been ignored by government and must be rectified

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: There is no evidence of impact that this would have on the long term. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limits, has not been determined or considered

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: The trade zones to provide an unofficial barrier to the market, which will result in equitable outcomes between zones

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them subject to further changes. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 65

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Modelling

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licensing. The overland flows are highly variable by nature

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale:

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: It's important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined water

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is extremely important

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: We need clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Our region is highly dependent on agriculture and irrigation agriculture. Government regulation is making it impossible to operate a farming business conditions of the Murray Darling Basin are too harsh

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support licensing and metering and reporting of all water take

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale:

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale:

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendments need to more clearly defined and that process involved in implementing them to ensure that it includes constitutional and engagement of our community in any further decisions

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 66

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:**

1.2. **Organisation name:** Barwon-Darling Water Inc

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Peer review

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** We support the licencing, monitoring, metering, and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. And we are disappointed that 20-years after other NSW water entitlements were brought into a legal framework, floodplain harvesting remains out of that licencing framework. It is also disappointing that the state government cannot provide entitlement holders with adequate information to make an informed decision around how to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing all water users and all communities directly impacted by this FPH reform. Consultation around local, valley-based rules seems to be an academic exercise at this time, as the parliament has not agreed to support the framework to enable licencing to occur. The Water Management (General) Amendment (Floodplain Harvesting) Regulation 2021 must be agreed to before valley-based rules can be drafted, the benefits and impacts modelled, and consulted with impacted water users and communities. Consequently, we support in-principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in these northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling, and water is abundant. These rules must allow for peak use at those rare times when the rivers are flooding, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use. This sort of accounting approach provides certainty for our local industry and the community. It is essential that this certainty of water access is available while ensuring overall limits can be achieved in the longer-term. These rules must consider the risks to local communities losing production, commercial activity, along with the risk to the environment and downstream communities which already seem to have been considered. Also, the community impact of accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take in the Gwydir, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares, the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. This compares with under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully

transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. The state government's intention is to licence this historical form of take (FPH) within defined limits, no more or no less. This is not an exercise in environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental and hydrological benefits. To achieve the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative social and economic impact of this reform on communities, and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and moderated by government, to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on affected regions.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: The negative community impacts of transitioning to FPH licences has been ignored by government and must be acknowledged. The intention of government is to licence an historical form of take called floodplain harvesting licencing, within defined limits, no more or no less. This is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. In achieving this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. The Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association submission provides much more information on this matter. Our concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not put in place and a flood occurs in the first years of the new arrangements, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The reduction would be far greater than the long-term requirements, and it will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs like the floods in 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are in place, there could be \$1.1B of economic losses in the Gwydir community, which cannot be regained. This will drive the community into a government enforced drought, and the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance) water will be foregone, but at least the Gwydir industry and community could have a share in the flows. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is not new and not without precedent, eg: the Gwydir Groundwater Plan. Under any licencing approach, unless there is a flood, there is no benefit to industry, community, or environment. However, a flood provides massive opportunities for all.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: We support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, especially if the rules are

so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. Where an updated model scenario shows the rules are too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. Its important that government be able to provide opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume. If there is water that should be made available than government has a responsibility to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach. I support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is an essential mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides to exit the industry, he or she needs to an opportunity to sell entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry. If there were no trade, water would be lost for production and lost from the community. And; If an environmental water holder decides to purchase additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the NWI and basin plan trade rules. Willing buyers with reductions under the FPH plan should be able to enter the market to restore their historic levels. An unrestricted market provides this mechanism. This allows for greater market flexibility and removes the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical. Applications to transfer entitlement above current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect environmental water must be implemented. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these highly variable systems. Active management will serve to limit access because there is limited information on how floodplains work, and localised rainfall events can create sudden flushes and localised flooding. Existing water management and monitoring systems are inadequate in these situations and there are significant risks of active management being implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule on those being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or

considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits it makes sense to undertake a socio-economic impact assessment.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process, especially as they do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. These amendments acknowledge that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires the recalibration of a valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: We support the licencing, metering, and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. We are disappointed that 20-years after other entitlements were properly licenced, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework, and that government cannot provide information to make informed decisions on how to achieve compliance with legal limits. This approach is failing water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. We support in-principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which occurs when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at the rare flood times, to provide the region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. This accounting approach provides certainty for the community and industry but ensures overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The state government’s intention is to licence this historical form of take (FPH) within defined limits, no more or no less. This is not an exercise in environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental and hydrological benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: The negative community impacts of transitioning to FPH licences has been ignored by government and must be acknowledged. The intention of government is to licence an historical form of take

called floodplain harvesting licencing, within defined limits, no more or no less. This is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. In achieving this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. The Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association submission provides much more information on this matter. Our concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not put in place and a flood occurs in the first years of the new arrangements, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The reduction would be far greater than the long-term requirements, and it will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs like the floods in 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are in place, there could be \$1.1B of economic losses in the Gwydir community, which cannot be regained. This will drive the community into a government enforced drought, and the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance) water will be foregone, but at least the Gwydir industry and community could have a share in the flows. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is not new and not without precedent, eg: the Gwydir Groundwater Plan. Under any licencing approach, unless there is a flood, there is no benefit to industry, community, or environment. However, a flood provides massive opportunities for all.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect environmental water must be implemented. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these highly variable systems. Active management will serve to limit access because there is limited information on how floodplains work, and localised rainfall events can create sudden flushes and localised flooding. Existing water management and monitoring systems are inadequate in these situations and there are significant risks of active management being implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule on those being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not been determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits it makes sense to undertake a socio-economic impact assessment.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is an essential mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. Trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable

outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the submission provided by the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence, especially when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments will be implemented. The amendments need to clearly articulate that process, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of the community on any future decisions. These amendments demonstrate that there is no perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires the recalibration of a valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: We also support the submissions made by the Gwydir Valley Water Users and the NSW Irrigators Council

Submission 67

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: No

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balance the highly variable nature of overland flows in the northern system, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using average in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is impossible to make an informed decision as we do not know what our entitlement will be and how much is a unit share. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and the opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long term volume is missed and there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding as was in 2011 & 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: No

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Please explain

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: All water should only be traded in the valley with equal opportunity

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Due to our location boarding a National Park it is hard for us to determine what is environmental water and what is flood water. When all water impacts us and our neighbours

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: There does not appear to be any clear rules which will give us no confidence going forward.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale:

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: It is impossible to make an informed decision as we do not know what our entitlements are.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: State water already has rules in place

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers to creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: Our farm is highly dependent on irrigates agriculture. Floodplain harvesting has up till now provided enough water to get through the droughts. With each rule change the government it eroding our ability to survive.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 68

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** Jim Cush

1.2. **Organisation name:**

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Peer review

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** this has been proposed as unlimited , then 6 years now 5 years over the last 10 years the reasoning behind 5ml share limit in account is because it doesn't flood every year a smaller entitlement with 5 meg unit account limit was a fair way to proceed .If some people do not want a carryover then the alternative is a much larger entitlement (5 times larger) and no carryover. After almost 2 decades this process of putting a volume limit on this historical form of water access has now been overtaken and consumed by political bastardisation with absolutely no will or compassion for our local communities , this whole process has had exhaustive investigation of eligible works for access and the storage of water , I do not pretend to understand the modelling but accept the fact it has been peer reviewed .

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** if a entitlement has been proposed and offered on the basis of a smaller volume with 5ml share limit, then it is appalling to show total disrespect to our local communities by renegeing on this principal in the initialisation of this FPH policy

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** if the politics determine a larger entitlement with no carry over then this does place pressure on remaining on cap, the only way to address this is with a variable AWD. This whole process is socialisation on a scale similar to the USSR 50 years ago, if QLD can treat an entitlement individually, why can't NSW if an entitlement holder creates the issue why is it all entitlement holders pay the price , this whole project has been socialised from 93/94 volumes being the size of the bucket, 2008 development being socialised over the 93/94 bucket, wetter parts of valley after creating the bucket are socialised over the drier parts. Adaptive management, in principle should be a fair way to start

addressing the easy just socialise the problem mentality that has been a part of water governance in NSW for a long long time. Adaptive management should be a way of addressing cap compliance thru management of individual entitlements anything else is socialisation

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: how the hell has the environment survived with unlimited FPH , now with limits coming in and a reduction of around 30 % of access there is no reason to restrict trade , This policy is about restricting access in a flood, flooding is still going to happen , Trade is essential , as was pointed out in Basin Plan 2012 , to allow market - based solutions to this reduction of water in our community , people who are against trade will more than likely not live in our affected community.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: I do not believe the department has the capacity to actively manage a flood, from storm to flood to gone can be as little 6 hours, I can not accept that the department that has taken 20 years to get to this stage has the capacity to actively manage anything in a timely manner

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Would you accept a ticket to the footy grand final with an open ended amendment provision, please can we have some certainty, our businesses have been attacked for over 30 years with water access reductions, this should be the last hit

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: consistency with regulated FPH entitlements should be way forward,

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: depends on the size of the entitlement which determines the account balance rules, with such a large change in water volumes that historically have been available to our community the fair and right thing is to start with full accounts

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: complexity we can do without

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: trade should be open as per the 2012 Basin Plan

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale:

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 69

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** A 5 year account management period is needed to even go close to getting within reach of long term average water availability on the floodplain. It is not uncommon for longer than 5year periods between floods and this needs to be reflected in the management rules to efficiently reflect the highly variable and ephemeral nature of the Gwydir system as well as the other northern rivers. Licencing and metering is needed to make sure the irrigation industry and regional communities and the environment have some sort of confidence in their wellbeing. A one year account management plan would be ludicrous with 5 to 10 years between valley wide floods (2011,20012 the last, with parts of the valley being flooded in 2016). Compliance needs to be met with common sense licensing and rules so as the community members and businesses are being looked after as best as possible and the environment will have lots more water, as in flood times virtually all of west of the Newell is under water. The current draft Plan pays no attention whatsoever to the implication to the local community and businesses.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The aim of government is to make the normal practice of flood plain harvesting compliant under the Water Act 2000 by volumetric licencing take of no more and no less. This needs to be done by transitioning to aid the recovery of communities from the effect of the drought. Transitioning was applied to the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Source when the long term water entitlements were larger than the designated sustainable limits. A full account limit start up would be required to save region from a \$1.1 billion loss, never to be recovered and another 5 to 10 years until the next flood catch up. The

last valley wide flood event of significance was 9 years ago in 2012, with some parts of the valley having flood flows in 2016.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: If the rules turn out to be too restrictive and take cannot reach compliance, or the reverse and compliance is being breached then this can be rectified by using the AWD.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: I support trading, but not trading zones. Some properties are in more than one and some in more than two trading zones. This is difficult especially when water from one zone links up with and joins another zone. When an irrigator sells his property and the buyer is not going to irrigate, and there are no buyers in that zone, what can he do with his licence. By allowing trade, the pluses and minuses of the share allocations can be levelled out in time. Trading to ones licensed infrastructure limitations could be allowed and after that at the discretion of the department. This is already done in the Gwydir with general security trading restrictions onto certain streams being limited. The environment is gaining water via the 31% reduction in productive take. This is a flood situation on a floodplain - water everywhere

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: As localised storm events create opportunities for localised harvesting, the event is passed by the time the department makes decisions. History has proved this. Active Management to protect held environmental water is a separate issue from a flooding event

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: A 5 year check or check after a full valley flood event is healthy and any changes put to the community and stakeholders for appraisal.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Regulated and unregulated rules need to be the same for simplicity. I recognize the the license have a different source, but its the same flood, same floodplain same storages same rainfall event. Why complicate the issue

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Basically answered in question 9.1. If a flood event happens in the first year and full account transitioning is not in place, then the industry and community have lost the opportunity to share the flows to compliance level. the environment still gains from the 31% reduction in extraction

and the benefit of a major flood. The community and industry has suffered the biggest drought on record, with many years of zero allocations and 9 years since the last valley wide flood in 2012.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: As per the same as question 13.1. This is a flood situation aimed at meeting compliance within the cap. It is not an exercise of overcomplicating the system \ with unnecessary restrictive rules

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Answer same as question 12.1. Same floodplain, same water same event. Many land holder have both reg and unreg licences some on the same property, some on another property, having zones is an unnecessary complication to efficient water use and is not needed.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The community needs a clear set of rules to be able to confidently base their businesses and livelihood off. A 5 year or after flood report and health check and recalibration of the modelling using up to date metering information is desirable.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: The social-economic affect has been left right out of the whole process and needs to be addressed. It should be a most important part of the process, but has been completely ignored. A social economic study needs to be done.

Submission 70

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Modelling

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: i fully support the licencing, metering reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. these rules only take into consideration the environment & downstream communities with no reference to our local community

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: under any licencing approach if there is not a flood there is neither an industry community or environmental benefit as the opportunity to harvest is not triggered

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: i support available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: if someone decides the industry is getting to difficult they need to have the opportunity to sell any entitlements and change there business model

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining enviromental outcomes must be implemented

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: they undermine confidence in the process and in our region when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: as per 9.1

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: as per 13.1

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: the amendments need to be more clear and to ensure that includes consultation and engagement of our community

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Floodplain harvesting measurement, Predicted environmental outcomes

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 71

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:**

1.2. **Organisation name:** Cotton Australia Limited

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar:

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Floodplain harvesting events, by their nature are unpredictable in terms of their timing and extent, are episodic and highly variable in their size. A 5ML per share account limit, with an open annual use limit, coupled to an annual account credit equal to the average annual allowed take, will allow licence holders to manage within the average allowed annual take, but take the water in a manner that is reflective of the highly variable nature of the events. The only viable alternative, in keeping with the spirit of recognising the highly episodic nature of FPH opportunity, would be to issue much higher annual entitlements (equal to the maximum likely annual take allowed to meet the annual average take) and no carry-over. This would be very detrimental in a perception sense, and would surely undermine public confidence in the licencing. Cotton Australia understands that the modelling by the Department reflects nearly 20 years of work, including very intensive work over the past three years, to ensure the licence volume, and the account management rules, would allow take in line with the sustainable take allowed under Cap and the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. Any deviation from this will be outside the spirit of this licencing, and cause significant social and economic harm in the affected communities and catchments. y access water irrigator use five year account management

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Floodplain harvesting take, and indeed floodplain harvesting licencing is not a new concept. Volumetric licencing under the WMA 2000 was always meant to recognise this take under the new legal framework. Just like old off-allocation access was licenced as supplementary water, and prior to that area based licences were transferred to volume based licences, the volumetric licencing of FPH is just the final step in the licencing conversions required under the WMA 2000. So that being the case, there is

nothing magical about July 1, 2021, it could have been done five years ago, ten years ago or at anytime. Therefore it is logical that the process should be that the Department should do a model run for each valley, and calculate if volumetric licencing had commenced say 10 years ago (the agreed date could be earlier or later), what would be the average volume in valley FPH accounts on July 1. The accounts should then be initialised to reflect that number. Any attempt to initialised with just 1 share, does not follow any logic associated with how take has been modelled and the long-term management rules developed. A rigid 1 unit share start will simply have grave social and economic impacts on the entitlement holder and the community the entitlement holder operates in, and is an ideological response, rather than one supported by the extensive process that has been developed by government over the past decade or more.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: It is important that the government has tools that not only ensure that take is no greater than the Sustainable Diversion Limit, but that entitlement holders have every opportunity to extract up to the Sustainable Diversion Limit. To ensure these outcomes, adaptive management is important.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: It is acknowledged by all parties that the Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce take from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional take, however, it will allow businesses to adapt and adjust if there historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. As this consultation points out trade is a requirement under the NWI, and should only be restricted where there isn't physical connectivity to support the trade.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Protection of environmental water should be paramount, but at this point in time, the case has not been made that would justify the addition of another level of complexity, or support the case that a floodplain harvesting event, could actually lead to the take of adaptive environmental water in the system. By its very nature a FPH event and a low flow event do not coincide.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions?

13.1. Please explain your rationale:

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale:

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Floodplain harvesting take, and indeed floodplain harvesting licencing is not a new concept. Volumetric licencing under the WMA 2000 was always meant to recognise this take under the new legal framework. Just like old off-allocation access was licenced as supplementary water, and prior to that area based licences were transferred to volume based licences, the volumetric licencing of FPH is just the final step in the licencing conversions required under the WMA 2000. So that being the case, there is nothing magical about July 1, 2021, it could have been done five years ago, ten years ago or at anytime. Therefore it is logical that the process should be that the Department should do a model run for each valley, and calculate if volumetric licencing had commenced say 10 years ago (the agreed date could be earlier or later), what would be the average volume in valley FPH accounts on July 1. The accounts should then be initialised to reflect that number. Any attempt to initialise with just 1 share, does not follow any logic associated with how take has been modelled and the long-term management rules developed. A rigid 1 unit share start will simply have grave social and economic impacts on the entitlement holder and the community the entitlement holder operates in, and is an ideological response, rather than one supported by the extensive process that has been developed by government over the past decade or more.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Protection of environmental water should be paramount, but at this point in time, the case has not been made that would justify the addition of another level of complexity, or support the case that a floodplain harvesting event, could actually lead to the take of adaptive environmental water in the system. By its very nature a FPH event and a low flow event do not coincide.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Unless there are absolutely identifiable hydrological connectivity reasons, trade should be enable, so entitlement holders have the capacity to adjust their businesses to the new licencing framework.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting

opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 72

1. **Who are you representing?**
 - 1.1. **Name:**
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:**
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:**
4. **Attended Gwydir public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** Yes
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It may only flood every 10 years
8. **Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences:** 1 ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Simple accounting
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** because of timing as water gets away before announcements are made
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** so it doesn't start to endanger hot spots
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** timing will always be an issue
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?**
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
14. **Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)?** Yes
 - 14.1. **Please explain your rationale:** it may be more accessible
15. **What initial Available Water Determination would you support?** 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Simple to keep track of

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Timing of announcements will always be a problem

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: pressure on sensitive areas

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

18.1. Please explain your rationale:

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback: Floodplain harvesting measurement

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: if metered when water enters property, why is there a need for storage metering. There will be gouge boards for back up

Submission 73

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** Brendan Griffiths

1.2. **Organisation name:**

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing metering and reporting of all water take. Longer accounting periods mean entitlements will be the less but the total volume of water is the same.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I managed to keep my 2 staff employed during drought thanks to the reserves that I managed to build up. This was from the last boom year in our region of 2016, when there was moderate flooding in some areas of the region and great river flows. If we are forced to miss this next flood, then I have exhausted my reserves and I may not make the next flood.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know

what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future".

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 74

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:** Brendan Griffiths

1.2. **Organisation name:**

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing metering and reporting of all water take. Longer accounting periods mean entitlements will be the less but the total volume of water is the same.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I managed to keep my 2 staff employed during drought thanks to the reserves that I managed to build up. This was from the last boom year in our region of 2016, when there was moderate flooding in some areas of the region and great river flows. If we are forced to miss this next flood, then I have exhausted my reserves and I may not make the next flood.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know

what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future".

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 75

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: Agree with recording of water taken. Prefer shorter accounting over longer accounting periods. The highly variable nature of overland flows should use averages allows opportunity to access when there is an abundant to store for the future.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale:

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:

9.1. Please explain your rationale:

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit

will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases,

people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 76

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if

the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no

longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I am the manager for an irrigated farm. Following floods we increase production which requires an extra 3 full time equivalent staff and six casual staff through the peak periods. This does not take into consideration the extra contractors or supply services used during the boom periods.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 77

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if

the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no

longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I am the manager for an irrigated farm. Following floods we increase production which requires an extra 3 full time equivalent staff and six casual staff through the peak periods. This does not take into consideration the extra contractors or supply services used during the boom periods.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 78

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if

the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no

longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I am the manager for an irrigated farm. Following floods we increase production which requires an extra 3 full time equivalent staff and six casual staff through the peak periods. This does not take into consideration the extra contractors or supply services used during the boom periods.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 79

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:**

1.2. **Organisation name:**

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if

the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no

longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I am the manager for an irrigated farm. Following floods we increase production which requires an extra 3 full time equivalent staff and six casual staff through the peak periods. This does not take into consideration the extra contractors or supply services used during the boom periods.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 80

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:**

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones:** No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the

centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I am the manager for an irrigated farm. Following floods we increase production which requires an extra 3 full time equivalent staff and six casual staff through the peak periods. This does not take into consideration the extra contractors or supply services used during the boom periods.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 81

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20 years after my entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at this rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long term. The fact these roles only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10 years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10 year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5 year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10 year to 92,260ML/year. This highlights that even the 5 year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10 year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. the cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last of the valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in the economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8 years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of a licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits (as suggested by the 10-year analysis). Its important that governments take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to productive water within legal limits. If there is water that should be **available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.**

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments

are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of

existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 82

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20 years after my entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at this rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long term. The fact these roles only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10 years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10 year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5 year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10 year to 92,260ML/year. This highlights that even the 5 year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10 year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. the cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last of the valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in the economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8 years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of a licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits (as suggested by the 10-year analysis). Its important that governments take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to productive water within legal limits. If there is water that should be **available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.**

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these

amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The

reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I

support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 83

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Modelling

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar

generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work.

Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I am the manager for an irrigated farm. Following floods we increase production which requires an extra 3 full time equivalent staff and six casual staff through the peak periods. This does not take into consideration the extra contractors or supply services used during the boom periods.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 84

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Modelling, Peer review

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if

the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no

longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I am the manager for an irrigated farm. Following floods we increase production which requires an extra 3 full time equivalent staff and six casual staff through the peak periods. This does not take into consideration the extra contractors or supply services used during the boom periods.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 85

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if

the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no

longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I am the manager for an irrigated farm. Following floods we increase production which requires an extra 3 full time equivalent staff and six casual staff through the peak periods. This does not take into consideration the extra contractors or supply services used during the boom periods.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 86

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if

the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no

longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. I am the manager for an irrigated farm. Following floods we increase production which requires an extra 3 full time equivalent staff and six casual staff through the peak periods. This does not take into consideration the extra contractors or supply services used during the boom periods.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on

the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 87

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: Simulates the variability of FPH. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: Represents the last 10 years of climate

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: No

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. However I am a realist the government has never used this mechanism (yes zone 1 has it but that's different there is no social pressure). The reality is this isn't a feasible option, sounds good to placate farmers that have their access wiped out but you know and I know if you increased an AWD it is likely to be too late for water users to access and floods aren't that considerate to come with advanced notice.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability. If someone decides the water is getting too bloody difficult too complicated and too beholden to misrepresented understandings. There are those that will seek to exit, and at the moment with

farmers in the north being thrown under the bus in metering, telemetry and FPH who could blame them.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Transparent and well understood rules provide certainty, active management is a new concept for the department that requires significant time to be developed and assessed. It is not appropriate for FPH where the information required in discrete systems, impact of flows and rainfall variation is not available. The data needed does not exist and it would prejudice the outcome against farmers regardless of genuine effort by department staff.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Water reform is exhausting our communities, the intent of the act to implement balanced outcomes and our support in good faith processes are eroded by amendment provisions. This is in direct competition with the desired effect that water regulation creates business confidence, it ultimately leads to a reduction in resources available to agricultural business as banks won't touch uncertainty.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale:

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale:

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Transparent and well understood rules provide certainty, active management is a new concept for the department that requires significant time to be developed and assessed. It is not appropriate for FPH where the information required in discrete systems, impact of flows and rainfall variation is not available. The data needed does not exist and it would prejudice the outcome against farmers regardless of genuine effort by department staff. There is no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term on environmental outcomes, data required, impact on valley cap and individual impacts.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale:

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale:

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 88

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most practical and store it for future use. This provides our community and the **industry certainty around water available for a range of agricultural uses.**

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** We were forced to lay off 2 employees during the past drought (through material capital investment/automation). I fully support water users being compliant with plan and cap rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought and major socio economic impacts. If flooding occurs as in 2011/12 this cost is \$1.1 billion, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The departments own data shows FPH will not change downstream flow outcomes, but will destroy my community.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. However I am a realist the government has never used this mechanism (yes zone 1 has it but that's different there is no social pressure). The reality is this isn't a feasible option, sounds good to placate farmers that have their access wiped out but you know and I know if you increased an AWD it is likely to be too late for water users to access and floods aren't that considerate to come with advanced notice.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability. If someone decides the water is getting too bloody difficult too complicated and too beholden to misrepresented understandings. There are those that will seek to exit, and at the moment with farmers in the north being thrown under the bus in metering, telemetry and FPH who could blame them. The trade zones are a barrier, the department know this because Namoi Water raised the restrictive methodology used in unregulated systems was not fit for purpose in the northern basin. There use in FPH is also impractical, trade on permanent basis will need to undergo an environmental assessment process, it shouldn't be limited to zones but will need clear guidelines and transparent criteria supported by real on the ground regional data (which does not exist at present).

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Transparent and well understood rules provide certainty, active management is a new concept for the department that requires significant time to be developed and assessed. It is not appropriate for FPH where the information required in discrete systems, impact of flows and rainfall variation is not available. The data needed does not exist and it would prejudice the outcome against farmers regardless of genuine effort by department staff. There is no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term on environmental outcomes, data required, impact on valley cap and individual impacts.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Water reform is exhausting our communities, the intent of the act to implement balanced outcomes and our support in good faith processes are eroded by amendment provisions. This is in direct competition with the desired effect that water regulation creates business confidence, it ultimately leads to a reduction in resources available to agricultural business as banks won't touch uncertainty. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. The northern basin is highly dependant on

agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available it provides security to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. We didn't cause this problem, we followed government rules and regulations to set down FMP pathways, to licence our works, to be efficient and manage water in terms of environmental provisions and we are being penalised because work that should have been done 20 years ago wasn't and now following on from a drought the decisions are being framed by a debate in areas that do not consider the broader context. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. The debate isn't being held on fair terms, there is no transparency of the hidden agendas and a lack of data and context is removing our communities reasonable

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: See above comments

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: See above comments

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: See above comments

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: See above comments

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: See above comments

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Floodplain harvesting measurement

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Why do we continue to punish Australian industry. Food & fibre requires inputs, & a noisy minority continue to sway public opinion & Government policy without proper/balanced regard for the interests of hard working tax paying Australian farmers. The industry is near impossible to operate within by reason of uncertainty & biased policy decisions. This nonsense must end.

Submission 89

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

8. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take on large installations. I struggle to see the cost benefit on smaller dams when a lot of the run-off, after large downpours, after an irrigation event, will contribute to the water going down the river, when a dryland farmer or grazier will have far less contribution to the river flow, especially since they are allowed to capture 10% rainfall runoff into their own dams without having to account for it. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most practical and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for a range of agricultural uses.

9. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with plan and cap rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought and major socio economic impacts. If flooding occurs as in 2011/12 this cost is \$1.1 billion, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my

business. The departments own data shows FPH will not change downstream flow outcomes, but will destroy my community.

10. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

10.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. However I am a realist the government has never used this mechanism (yes zone 1 has it but that's different there is no social pressure). The reality is this isn't a feasible option, sounds good to placate farmers that have their access wiped out but you know and I know if you increased an AWD it is likely to be too late for water users to access and floods aren't that considerate to come with advanced notice.

11. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

12. Support the proposed trading zones: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability. If someone decides the water is getting too bloody difficult too complicated and too beholden to misrepresented understandings. There are those that will seek to exit, and at the moment with farmers in the north being thrown under the bus in metering, telemetry and FPH who could blame them. The trade zones are a barrier, the department know this because Namoi Water raised the restrictive methodology used in unregulated systems was not fit for purpose in the northern basin. There use in FPH is also impractical, trade on permanent basis will need to undergo an environmental assessment process, it shouldn't be limited to zones but will need clear guidelines and transparent criteria supported by real on the ground regional data (which does not exist at present).

13. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Transparent and well understood rules provide certainty, active management is a new concept for the department that requires significant time to be developed and assessed. It is not appropriate for FPH where the information required in discrete systems, impact of flows and rainfall variation is not available. The data needed does not exist and it would prejudice the outcome against farmers regardless of genuine effort by department staff. There is no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term on environmental outcomes, data required, impact on valley cap and individual impacts.

14. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Water reform is exhausting our communities, the intent of the act to implement balanced outcomes and our support in good faith processes are eroded by amendment provisions. This is in direct competition with the desired effect that water regulation creates business confidence, it ultimately leads to a reduction in resources available to agricultural

business as banks won't touch uncertainty. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. The northern basin is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available it provides security to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. We didn't cause this problem, we followed government rules and regulations to set down FMP pathways, to licence our works, to be efficient and manage water in terms of environmental provisions and we are being penalised because work that should have been done 20 years ago wasn't and now following on from a drought the decisions are being framed by a debate in areas that do not consider the broader context. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. The debate isn't being held on fair terms, there is no transparency of the hidden agendas and a lack of data and context is removing our communities reasonable access to a source of water that should be shared.

15. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

15.1. Please explain your rationale: See above comments

16. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

16.1. Please explain your rationale: See above comments

17. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: See above comments

18. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: See above comments

19. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

19.1. Please explain your rationale: See above comments

20. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Floodplain harvesting measurement

21. Your feedback:

21.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: As my storage dam is relatively small <100mg, I cannot justify the vast expense to get it metered when;

a) there hasn't been a decent FPH event in the last 15 years,

b) the dam doesn't now hold water and it recharges the aquifer at a rate of at least 37liters a second. I should be getting paid for artificial recharge

Submission 90

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Downstream outcomes, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20 years after my entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at this rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long term. The fact these roles only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10 years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10 year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5 year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10 year to 92,260ML/year. This highlights that even the 5 year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10 year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. the cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last of the valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in the economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8 years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or

environmental benefit of a licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits (as suggested by the 10-year analysis). Its important that governments take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to productive water within legal limits. If there is water that should be **available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.**

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making

them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended

drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing.

This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 91

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20 years after my entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at this rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long term. The fact these roles only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10 years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10 year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5 year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10 year to 92,260ML/year. This highlights that even the 5 year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10 year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is

not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. the cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last of the valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in the economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8 years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of a licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits (as suggested by the 10-year analysis). Its important that governments take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to productive water within legal limits. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation

and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The

reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I

support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 92

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20 years after my entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at this rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long term. The fact these roles only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10 years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10 year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5 year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10 year to 92,260ML/year. This highlights that even the 5 year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10 year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. the cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last of the valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in the economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8 years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of a licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits (as suggested by the 10-year analysis). Its important that governments take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to productive water within legal limits. If there is water that should be **available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.**

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these

amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The

reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I

support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 93

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:**

1.2. **Organisation name:**

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Environmental, Downstream outcomes, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20 years after my entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at this rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long term. The fact these roles only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10 years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10 year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5 year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10 year to 92,260ML/year. This highlights that even the 5 year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the

long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10 year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. the cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last of the valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in the economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8 years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or

environmental benefit of a licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits (as suggested by the 10-year analysis). Its important that governments take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to productive water within legal limits. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making

them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended

drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing

floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 94

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern Inland Valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Modelling

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Access to floodplain harvesting is highly variable. There are long periods of time when there is no opportunity to harvest water from the flood plain and short periods of time when it is possible. The FPH component of the cap is based on an average over time so the allowable take should also be averaged over time and the five year account management rule enables this.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is vital from a business viability point of view that the initial water determination is 5ml per share to reflect the water availability conditions irrigators have experienced over the past 5 years. We have had a long drought and a pumping embargo during this period. Irrigation businesses have been significantly impacted by the shortage of water during this period. Flood plain harvesting events are rare. If for example the initial available water determination started at 1 unit share and we had a large flood plain harvesting event within the next 12 months irrigators would miss out on 80% of the entitlement they would have had access to in the absence of the licensing process. Based on our five year average annual diversions a loss of 80% of the available water harvesting would cost our business \$3.2 million. This is significant as a one off but combined with a 4 year drought previously will be devastating. Additionally the DPIE modelling shows that changes in the level of floodplain harvesting in a large flood event have minimal impact on environmental outcomes downstream. So the level of starting available water determination is very important to irrigators as it will have every little impact on the environment.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: Only if the determinations work in both directions. I am in favour of the adjustment of the available water determination to keep the take at cap limits.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. and/or If environmental water holder decide they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical

take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately

implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: There should be consideration given to the provision of an active management mechanism for notification of the start and ending of environmental management and the trigger for enabling floodplain harvesting once an environmental management event has been disrupted by a flood plain harvestable event.

Submission 95

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The fact these rules only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is being implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. It is important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available then governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. and/or If an environmental water holder decides they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e.

they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not been determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at

these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be

acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 96

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The fact these rules only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is being implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. It is important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available then governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. and/or If an environmental water holder decides they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e.

they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at

these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not been determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be

acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 97

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The fact these rules only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is being implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. It is important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available then governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. and/or If an environmental water holder decides they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e.

they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not been determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at

these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be

acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 98

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The fact these rules only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is being implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. It is important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available then governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. and/or If an environmental water holder decides they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e.

they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not been determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at

these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not been determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be

acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 99

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement's, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. The fact these rules only take into consideration, risk to the environment and downstream communities with no reference to our local community is evidence the process is flawed. The community impact of each accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. Whereas, under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in 2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the Basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. It is important to note that the government's intent of floodplain harvesting licencing

is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits as well as some flow benefits but marginal. It is important to note that to achieve just the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M to achieve these limits which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative community impact of this reform and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and mitigated by government to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on regions where this is being implemented.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. If an updated model scenario is undertaken that proves the rules were too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. It is important that governments can take action to enable all opportunities for water users to have access to their legally defined volume of water. If there is water that should be made available then governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach, allowing for this to occur. We support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which to ensure compliance with legal limits are reducing water availability on average by 31%. This allows a market-based mechanism for individuals to manage their businesses. Trade is extremely important under two key examples. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensures that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. and/or If an environmental water holder decides they want to secure additional water during floods, then they can enter the market to purchase entitlements from willing sellers for use and application for their outcomes. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between designated zones and should be removed. This will also ensure consistency with the Basin Plan Trade Rules. Willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level and an unrestricted trading market provides this mechanism. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above their current conditions limit, may be subject to a more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e.

they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not been determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

Proposed water sharing plan rules for floodplain harvesting in the Gwydir unregulated river water source

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. I am also frustrated that 20-years after my other entitlement’s, floodplain harvesting remains out of the licencing framework and that government cannot provide me adequate information to make an informed decision around how best to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government’s approach is failing those water users and communities directly impacted by this reform. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. With that in mind, I can support in principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern

ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times when we are in flood, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use, when it is most abundant. An accounting approach in this manner provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation at times but ensure overall limits can be achieved in the long-term. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental benefits.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to licences and operation within the licencing framework, has been ignored by government and must be rectified. It is important to note that the government intent of floodplain harvesting licencing is to licence this historical form of take within defined limits, no more or no less, it is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. To do this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. My concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not established and a flood occurs in the first years of the program, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The immediate reduction is not only far greater than the long-term requirements, but it also will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs, on the scale similar to 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are provided then this could be \$1.1B lost in economic activity to our community, which cannot be regained, and will put us back into a government enforced drought. In this circumstance the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance as suggested) will result in water foregone in these circumstances but at least our industry and community could have a share in the flows. I also note that under the Achieving Sustainable Groundwater Entitlements whereby long-term take and entitlements in the Lower Gwydir Groundwater Water Source, were greater than allowable limits at the time, the NSW Government took steps to transition these users through to compliance over an average of 8-years. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is therefore not new and not without precedent in categories of water take whereby legal limits have been exceeded. It's important to note that under any licencing approach, if there is not a flood there is neither an industry, community or environmental benefit of licencing as the opportunity to harvest has not been triggered

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed with water, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and localised flooding and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. The capability of existing water management and monitoring systems to manage for this scenario has not been addressed and presents significant risks to this being appropriately implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits, no more or no less, we demand that a socio-economic impact assessment is undertaken.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. For more information refer to the Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association Submission.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region, particularly when they do not provide a clear process for how these amendments are implemented. The amendments need to more clearly articulate that process involved in implementing them, to ensure that it includes consultation and engagement of our community in any future decisions. What these amendments do achieve, is acknowledgement that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. We support an amendment that requires at year five or after a flood event, the recalibration of our valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. I support amendment provides that reflect opportunities for the cumulative effect of water reform must be

acknowledged and considered and out our community at the centre of decision making.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 100

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user – floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Northern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Account Limit Initialisation is standard practice across all NSW entitlements. Shorter accounting periods will create more uncertainty as entitlement volumes will need to be re-calculated & all socio-economic & environmental assessments would need to be re-worked as they have all been done with the 5 year period built in. 5 year accounting period & Account Limit Initialisation have been part of the NSW FPH Policy since 2013 - this is not new to anyone. Water-users fully support licencing, metering & accountability of all water extractions & have done so for decades. 5 year accounting period was agreed by SAP, environmental agencies since 2013 as it provided flexibility for all concerned in meeting all requirements of the FPH Policy.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Account Limit Initialisation is standard practice across all NSW entitlement categories. Anything less than 5ML/share at initialisation will create an artificial restriction above what the FPH Policy is meant to deliver & create unwarranted economic impacts on already struggling communities for no demonstrable outcome beyond political opportunism. This would in effect be a Government-induced drought.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** AWD's are standard mechanisms in use on many NSW water entitlements as a way of managing CAP & SDL. We support its use in managing FPH in the same way to meet NSW commitments under CAP & Basin Plan

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow farmers to adjust to Government policy changes & must be made as broadly flexible as possible. The imposition of Trading Zones creates arbitrary limits where they are not necessarily required. A more sensible approach would be to assess potential impacts of trades as is already done in other NSW water categories, including groundwater.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: "Active Management" has become "shifting goalposts" & introduces additional unwarranted levels of uncertainty & reduces our community's ability to be resilient. There is no evidence that it can produce any better results for the environment, but clear evidence of the social & economic impact that can result from it's use.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Again, these are an additional, unwarranted inclusion at the last minute which create more uncertainty & reduce community confidence. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up when she stated: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: We support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. We support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: We fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being

in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B and put us back into a government-induced drought and likely to destroy many businesses in our community. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not been determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new government policy changes. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: Again, these are an additional, unwarranted inclusion at the last minute which create more uncertainty & reduce community confidence. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up when she stated: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 101

1. **Who are you representing?**
 - 1.1. **Name:**
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:**
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user - floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:**
4. **Attended Gwydir public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** Yes
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
8. **Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences:** More than 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** No
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
14. **Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)?** Yes
 - 14.1. **Please explain your rationale:**
15. **What initial Available Water Determination would you support?** More than 1ML per unit share
 - 15.1. **Please explain your rationale:**

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale:

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale:

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale:

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 102

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:**

1.2. **Organisation name:** Southern Riverina Irrigators Inc

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - non floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Southern inland valley

3.1. **If other, please specify:**

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** In 1994 storages in the entire northern basin were less than 600GL. Today it is almost 1,500GL plus there has been significant growth in channels and other interception storages that either hold water up or capture it. Presently, in one wet year it is possible for as much water to be diverted in the Gwydir Valley alone as it was possible to store in the entire northern NSW valleys in 1994. The carryover rules appear designed to match the large increases in storage and are contrary to the principle of the Cap that in wet years there is less diversions (due to their being lower needs/ability to irrigate). In the Gwydir Valley there will now be more diversions in wet years as a consequence of this accounting rule and the large % of carryover. It is presently unlawful which is why DPIE is attempting to increase the SDL in the Gwydir Valley by such a large %.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences:

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:**

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This consultation process is empty because this is a contrived questionnaire that avoids providing opportunities for serious feedback and criticisms. In flood years there is a surplus of water in the valley but not necessarily downstream. So of course, AWD's should limit take. Unfortunately the lack of restrictions on water access rules would mean that water will still be taken. If it is not applied to a licence this year, a landholder may just wait until the next dry period to apply it. Just as they can with any water taken under the recently introduced "emergency water exemption".

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes**11. Support the proposed trading zones: No**

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Again, your questions do not allow proper exploration of this issue. The Basin Plan says at Clause 12.18 (Restrictions allowable for physical or environmental reasons) that there can and should be restrictions for various reasons. Floodplain Harvesting as at 1994 levels of development has already been over allocated, over-exploited and allowing trade of what NSW deemed in 2002 to be a "bonus" source of water and nothing more, is gross mismanagement. Put in other words, if a person purchases a property at a premium because it is on a river with free access to flowing water (such as landholders in the Lower Darling) and due to trading and manipulation this river no longer flows and the landholder has to de-stock and sell their property at a discount to, for example nearby properties which adjoin the flowing Murray River, there will be a cause of action to recover this loss against the landholders who stopped the river flowing and/or the authority for overseeing it. Will the DPIE conduct a proper analysis to ensure no negative third party impacts for each and every trade? Infrastructure to divert the water will also remain after the trade. Even if said infrastructure is slightly decommissioned, it may be re-instated and used to capture water pursuant to the Water Management (General) Amendment (Emergency Works Exemption) Regulation 2021. In flood years the cost of buying water is always less than in dry years. As such, it is possible to "game" the system by recommissioning works to capture emergency water and then convert this for commercial use via a cheap purchase of allocation off a supplementary or FPH licence. This is the antithesis of what the Basin Plan sets out to achieve. The benefits to the environment are completely disregarded.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Without water access rules how will there be "active management". This pays lip service to actual appropriate management. Historically, and the NSW DLWC records show this, the needs of storage in Menindee and the environment were put first before the collection of off-allocation flows. Unfortunately, and despite the best intentions of the Water Act, this has been hijacked in a tragedy of the commons and pure greed to take excessive flows without any consideration for others. All southern valleys have compromised and lost water (without compensation - not like these licences) for the greater good. The current "consultative" process is lip service because the licence application process has already begun in earnest. Landholders can have unlimited attempts at obtaining the highest volumes possible and there are consultants who are assisting many people to get large volumes for their licences because they just happen to know the formulas devised by DPIE to determine this. ICAC was scathing of the people involved with the Barwon Darling WSP 2012 and other acts since. Nothing has changed (well Minister Pavey says that she's adopted 5 recommendations out of 15), and history will show that these people have overseen the destruction of thriving environments and communities. History will not be kind to the people who

blatantly disregarded common sense and practical guidance. The use of a computer model, despite reality clearly showing a different effect will be indefensible. The taxpayer will be left with a large bill whilst the chairman of NSW IC and other lobbyists and national party supporters receive a huge financial windfall.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The proposed amendments are not based entirely on real data. There are too many assumptions. There is too much reliance upon models rather than an assessment against 1994 levels of development. An assumption that more water will return to rivers because you have assumed how much water is being taken and you assume that by taking less than that assumed volume, there will be a higher volume that returns to rivers and better downstream impacts is not robust and poor management. It is also in contravention of the water management principles (found at section 5 of the WMA) and all acts made pursuant to the WMA must be in accordance with these principles (s9 WMA). Therefore its unlawful. The rainfall runoff exemption hasn't even been modelled. It goes against the spirit of the Cap (and is in contravention to it). If landholders have changed their practices so that they now use more chemicals (such as on cotton) or have more landforming which captures more water, why should they be given a free pass. They should account for this water in their total diversions. To remove this, it allows even greater extractions and more adverse impacts on downstream and dependant ecosystems, thereby making in unlawful.

Proposed water sharing plan rules for floodplain harvesting in the Gwydir unregulated river water source

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Once again, larger storages allow for greater diversions in times when it would not have previously occurred. Downstream dependant ecosystems are adversely impacted and the environment misses out on vital natural events. We know that the DPIE will not listen to any of these comments however we are putting them on record to remind it in the future that all of this was completely obvious. NSW chose to ignore or disregard the law, just months after it was the recipient of a scathing report by the Independent Commission against Corruption. NSW wont listen to ICAC so we do not expect it will listen to SRI. However, it will be held to account for these sins.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support?

15.1. Please explain your rationale:

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: In 1999 the NSW DLWC reported that it took 3 floods to get Menindee to start to fill. The benefits to the environment there was enormous. NSW said that it was vitally important to restrict off-allocation flows to

get this water through the system. Active management should stop water take via this method until such time as the Menindee Lakes are full or are in the process of filling.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Of course not. The defenders of low flows down the Darling blame climate change. How can NSW allow the over-use extraction via these licences to continue despite everyone acknowledging that we have less water inflows.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: As Dan Connor would say, comparing these water rights to those in a regulated system - such as NSW Murray Valley - is not comparing apples with apples. Allowing people to take more and more water and to move this right around properties, when geography (not channels) determine where water runs in any event, is extremely shortsighted policy that is open to exploitation. Downstream dependant ecosystems are adversely impacted and this is unlawful.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: The reports and information contain a lot of assumptions. There is no robust data. Licences should not be granted until the complete picture is understood. NSW say that the 2012 Basin Plan figures are wrong/outdated (and hence they need to update SDL's). On what basis should people have confidence in the current numbers when they dont have any robust data and are filled with absurd assumptions such as 100% return flows of water.

Submission 103

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - non floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Southern inland valley

3.1. If other, please specify:

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This is a backdoor to 500% carryover, with the onset of climate change this will only allow FPH even greater access to flood events that are predicted to become less frequent. It would allow low security Flood Plain Harvested Water to take 5 times their allocation before other environmental and higher security water users downstream, received any allocation at all!

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1 ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The idea that saving carryover for a number of years before accessing a larger flow, will result in healthier floodplains is ludicrous. Any water taken from an unregulated flow will have an effect on floodplains downstream. If your modelling does not show this, you are using inaccurate data to model with. It is very clear that anytime FP Harvesting has access to 4 or 500%, there will be a direct and substantial effect on the head height of any unregulated flow. Substantial affects have been and will continue to be felt by Lower Darling Floodplains and other critical water needs since the illegal take of flood plain water has been allowed to flourish over recent decades. Maximum carryover ever should be 100%, in line with other river valley Regulations. The cap should also not be exceeded in any year.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is obvious the department does not have an accurate measure of water that has historically been taken, adaptive management will be required to make any FPH take fair and equitable to all downstream users. Every flood event is different and the department will need levers and mechanisms to allow water for all not just a select few.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. Please explain your rationale: It is important that water only be traded in zones to protect high value environmental areas. It is also important to avoid the situation we see on the Murray and Murrumbidgee where a lot of water is wasted in transmission losses.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: It is a requirement of the water act to protect held environment water.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? Yes

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Access to FPH in unregulated rivers should be restricted to annual access rules to maintain consistency with rules across all river systems

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1 ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licensed entitlement should not be a larger volume. It is inequitable to allow FPH to access multiples of their entitlement before downstream can access critical water supplies for human and environmental needs. The Water act quite clearly states the environment needs are a top priority. Environmental needs need to be met all the way to Wentworth before special favours are given to opportunistic Irrigators.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: It is a requirement of the Basin Plan to protect Held Environmental Water from extraction

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

18.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Box 9 seems to be glitching, I was unable to read my text after writing it. Not all of the text would show up.

Submission 104

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. Name:

1.2. Organisation name:

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - non floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. If other, please specify: Toowoomba, QLD

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation.

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: Yes

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. I do not support shorter accounting periods as it will result in more entitlements, which seem at odds with community concerns around take. Longer accounting periods mean there are less entitlements, but the total volume of water is the same. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

8. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community. REDACTED usually employ 20 permanent people (and up to 88 direct causal employees) but after floods we will increase this to match demand. If the local industry is forced to miss the next flooding opportunity

then we will not have the increased demand and be able to employ the additional staff and be in extended drought.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: I support allowing available water determinations to be varied as a way to manage take within limits, but particularly if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. Every dollar generated from agriculture circles through our economy at least twice. If there is water that should be available to the local industry than governments, have a responsibility to make good and make efforts to ensure its available. Our communities demand it.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements, which are reducing water availability on average by 31%. If someone decides the industry is getting too difficult (and it seems that way) they need to have an opportunity to sell any entitlements and change their business model. This ensure that all available water can be used by the industry, rather than if there was no trade then it would be lost from production and lost from our community. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones. We know what the current conditions of access is, and willing water users should be able to utilise the market to secure, back up to this historical level. This will allow for greater market flexibility and remove the unnecessary barriers created by the proposed zones, which appear impractical to implement. Applications to transfer entitlement above that current conditions limit will require more detailed assessment. Given infrastructure limitations, I support permanent trade but not temporary trading at this stage.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which may be primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The

cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community's ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: "The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future". Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed.

14. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

14.1. Please explain your rationale: I support the licencing, metering and reporting of all water take. Consistency with other floodplain harvesting entitlements in the valley should be enforced. I support rules which ensure future access remains within limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Using averages in this way must allow for peak use at these rare times, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use. This provides our community and the industry certainty around water available for irrigation.

15. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? More than 1ML per unit share

15.1. Please explain your rationale: I fully support water users being compliant with their rules but the community impact of transitioning to these licences has been ignored by government and must be rectified. If a flood occurs in the first years of the program and that opportunity to access up to the new compliant, long-term volume is missed there will be significant reduction in water, greater than that required to achieve compliance. This will result in the region being in an extended drought. If flooding occurs as in 2011 and 2012 this could be \$1.1B, and put us back into a government enforced drought and likely to destroy my business. The reduction will have no additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flood but will destroy our community.

16. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? No

16.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect water users and the community from undermining environmental outcomes must be implemented i.e. they are not accessing held environmental water. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these systems which maybe primed, near full and spilling. It must be acknowledged there is limited information regarding how floodplains work, localised rainfall events could create sudden flushes and that must be recognised in any decision to limit this form of access

using this mechanism. There was no evidence of impact that this would have on the long-term. The impact of this rules to those individuals being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered.

17. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? No

17.1. Please explain your rationale: Trade is essential to allow a mechanism for water users and the community to adapt to new rules and metering requirements. These trading zones within the unregulated catchments already provide significant, unjustified barriers to trade from rivers and creeks and should be reviewed. As the floodplains are connected in times of flood there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. The trade zones provide an artificial barrier to the market, which will result in inequitable outcomes between zones.

18. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? No

18.1. Please explain your rationale: The amendment provisions undermine the certainty provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them “subject to further changes”. They undermine confidence in the process and in our region. The cumulative effect of water reform must be acknowledged and considered. Our region is highly dependant on agriculture and irrigated agriculture, when water is available is what provides our region its boom to get through the next drought. Each rule change, government is removing our community’s ability to be resilient. Robbie Sefton, Chair of the Independent Assessment into Social and Economic Conditions in the Murray Darling Basin summed it up for me: “The future is no longer secure or certain for some people and regions, despite their hard work. Morale has eroded, and a sense of hopelessness is spreading; in many cases, people no longer feel confident in their future”. Our community is never put at the centre of any debate about water but rather we are the target, the cause of the problems. Government is enabling our community to be destroyed. Water sharing plans are also due for review and replacement every 10-years, this process can address any required changes and the unregulated plan is due for review in the next year.

19. Select subject you want to provide feedback on:

20. Your feedback:

20.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Submission 105

1. Who are you representing?

1.1. **Name:**

1.2. **Organisation name:** Australian Floodplain Association

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Water user - non floodplain harvester

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. **If other, please specify:** MDB-wide

4. Attended Gwydir public webinar: Yes

Which supporting documents have you read? Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Report to assist community consultation

5. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

6. Support 5-year account management rules: No

6.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This is a stealthy way of introducing a 500% carryover rule. Over time this WILL result in increased take in the Gwydir and reduced benefits in the valley and downstream.

7. Available water determination (AWD) support for floodplain harvesting (reg) licences: 1ML per unit share

7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume than is currently permitted. An increased (over current conditions) will impact on the magnitude of flood events which are crucial to flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge; and which play an important role in drought recovery.

8. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The total volume taken by FPH is far greater than previously understood/accepted but FPH take is still unmetered. The AWD must be variable to adjust to more accurate information.

9. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

10. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

10.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Trading WITHIN zones will help ensure environmental and cultural assets are protected from increases in take.

11. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Proposed rules will protect HEW - a requirement of the Basin Plan that must be upheld

12. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: The framework must allow FPH rules in WSPs to be amended WITHOUT triggering taxpayer funded compensation.

13. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river account management rules (3 year rolling average)? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: For clarity, certainty etc access to FPH in unregulated rivers should be restricted to annual access rules. This will maintain consistency with rules across all streams in the Gwydir valley.

14. What initial Available Water Determination would you support? 1ML per unit share

14.1. Please explain your rationale: Flood flow events - even small ones - are crucial to flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge; and which play an important role in drought recovery

15. Do you support the proposed application of Active Management to floodplain harvesting (unregulated river) access licences? Yes

15.1. Please explain your rationale: For protection of HEW as required under the MDB Plan

16. Do you support the proposed replication of unregulated river trading zones? Yes

16.1. Please explain your rationale: This will help to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction

17. Do you support the proposed amendment provisions? Yes

17.1. Please explain your rationale: The framework must allow FPH rules in WSPs to be amended WITHOUT triggering taxpayer funded compensation.

18. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

19. Your feedback:

20. Please provide feedback in the box below: Insufficient attention paid to connectivity downstream and the need to repair decades of damage from over-extraction as a matter of urgency. An End of System flow target is needed. Rules must restrict FPH access upstream until end of system flow targets are met, to ensure that flood flows reach the Barwon-Darling."