

## Details

**Meeting:** Healthy Floodplains Review Committee Meeting

**Location:** Microsoft Teams

**Date/time:** Wednesday 6 May 2021  
8.30am – 9.45am, 12.00 - 2pm

**Chairperson:** [REDACTED]

## Apologies

[REDACTED], Director Healthy Floodplains  
[REDACTED], [REDACTED] Consulting

## People present

### Committee:

1. [REDACTED], Independent Chair of the Healthy Floodplains Review Committee
2. [REDACTED], NSW Nature Conservation Council representative and landholder, Mudgee
3. [REDACTED], NSW Irrigators Council representative, local irrigator and landholder, Moree
4. [REDACTED], Landholder from the Liverpool Plains

### Guests:

5. [REDACTED], Advisor to Committee
6. [REDACTED], Alluvium Australia Pty Ltd (for modelling)

### DPIE-Water Healthy Floodplains:

7. [REDACTED], Principal Project Officer
8. [REDACTED], Manager Floodplain Harvesting
9. [REDACTED], Senior Project Officer
10. [REDACTED], Senior Project Officer
11. [REDACTED], Senior Project Officer
12. [REDACTED], Project Officer (minutes)

## This meeting

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
1	Meeting open 8.30am		
2	<p>Declaring conflict of interests.</p> <p>Nil declared.</p> <p>██████████ – The same as the previous meeting: declared his cousins ██████████ and ██████████ work for ██████████. Also, N132 ██████████ is owned by ██████████, a cousin (note this submission was not discussed at this meeting). ██████████ declared no financial interests in either.</p> <p>██████████ – Barwon-Darling modelling – individual floodplain harvesting interest, will not chair that component,</p>	Noted	
3	<p>Adoption of minutes dated 21 April 2021</p> <p>Moved by ██████████</p> <p>Seconded by ██████████</p>	Carried	

<p>4 Returning submission N068 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] joined meeting for item 4 discussion with committee.</p> <p>Committee has concerns about recommending, take works not on an individual property (unless part of a syndicate). N064 has infrastructure legally attached to N064, but N068 may benefit but is there a formal agreement in place? Policy does not provide direction for this situation.</p> <p>[REDACTED] explained that at 3 July 2008 the channel, river pumps and internal lift pumps were existing and connected to OFS1 via a channel and culvert under the road (still there today). There is a dirt block in channel so that if N068 required that channel a temporary agreement could be made. In 2008 it was owned by the one property, it may now be connected to the and [REDACTED] (was a GW only property in 2008)</p> <p>[REDACTED] - Can only make application for works on your own property. Can't bestow a rate for FPH using someone else's infrastructure, without evidence of a formal agreement.</p> <p>[REDACTED] -To clarify the committee is asked to decide on a request from N068 both located on N064:</p> <p>Issue 7 - change of pump flow rate to 150ML/day</p> <p>Issue 8 – the channel with an intake rate.</p> <p>[REDACTED] not prepared to support.</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Are they eligible for N064? N068 be just assessed in isolation?</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Still eligible, must work out who which property it is?</p> <p>[REDACTED] - Legally when property right was sold, unless they sold a water</p>	<p>Deferred until further information received by [REDACTED] on recent sale contract (2009) for properties. Check if contract lists assets and ongoing use of channel.</p> <p>[REDACTED] to check how the modelling under current conditions dealt with the two properties. – did it rest with N064 or N068? How was it apportioned?</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] to advise.</p>
---	--	--

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
	<p>right then appears that it remains without a division in the property right as that is where they originally. [REDACTED] agrees.</p> <p>[REDACTED] – would a letter suffice?</p> <p>[REDACTED] prefers contract.</p> <p>[REDACTED] requires legal agreement.</p> <p>[REDACTED] - N068 has requested that modelled at 2008 and access to breakout floodwater of 22500ML/day which is limited by the daily lift capacity of the pump.</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Works Approval will only be attributed to the property where infrastructure sits.</p>	<p>Committee Determined: To wait until further information is available from [REDACTED].</p>	
5	<p>Returning submission N140 [REDACTED] Issue 5.</p>		
	<p>Meeting paused at 9.45am and reconvened at 12.00pm.</p>		
6	<p>Returning Submission N140 [REDACTED] Issue 5.</p>	<p>HFPRC determination: Issue 5 - supported K4 as temporary storage with a capacity of 35.2ML.</p>	
7	<p>Outstanding submission determination – [REDACTED] N080 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] deferred to next meeting</p>		
8	<p>Outstanding submission determination – [REDACTED] N144 [REDACTED] deferred to next meeting</p>		
9	<p>Retraction of Groundwater and Unregulated properties endorsement by [REDACTED] – deferred to next meeting</p>		
	<p>[REDACTED] joined meeting at 1.10pm, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] left the meeting.</p>		

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
10	New Submission N099 [REDACTED] Issue 1. Requesting change from 2x 1200 to 1 x 1200mm and 1 x 1500mm 82ML Issue 2 – Requesting FPH 5 change in pump capacity from 2x 500mm pumps with a capacity of 74ML to 84ML/day.	HFPRC determination: Issue 1 - Support change from 2 x1200 to 1 x 1200mm and 1 x 1500mm. Issue 2 – Support FPH 5 change in pump capacity from 2x500mm pumps with a capacity of 70ML to 84ML/day for a total of capacity of 168 ML/day combined.	

<p>11 Committee to note the [REDACTED] Macquarie modelling report.</p> <p>[REDACTED] – IQQM report changes and did it affect outcome? Is it fiddling with the model?</p> <p>[REDACTED] - The model is calibrated to align with the other lines of evidence. It was minor errors in software, did not occur in other valleys but it did occur in the Macquarie – the way storages behaved -pumping at low volume. Anomalies with observed behaviour and crop results that were not consistent with other lines of evidence therefore model changes were made.</p> <p>Didn't align with crop results therefore, just affected a few properties- just on the farm storage configuration that caused a problem.</p> <p>The fix is applied across the whole model domain to be consistent across the whole 27 properties but only affected several properties.</p> <p>[REDACTED] overarching issues list?</p> <p>[REDACTED] – look for systematic errors – eg submissions continually calling out certain, how well has storage issues been resolved, how is rainfall runoff component simulated and is it consistent with other lines of available evidence. Continues to do with each review so it is fair and equitable for all water users including the environment.</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Requests Themes paper?</p> <p>[REDACTED] and the NSW Nature Conservation Council whilst it is an OK process, there are concerns about using the Budyco curves (Neuman report) for estimating conditions of the valley, including the rainfall runoff coefficient used now to</p>	<p>[REDACTED] to provide a list of overarching issues that he looks at.</p> <p>DPIE emailed 10 May 2021.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>
---	--	-------------------

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
	<p>estimate entitlements Macquarie model had changes made to it as a result.</p> <p>██████ – The Budeko curves is all that is available now. Further work has been identified by the Water and Environment research partnership with CSIRO and MDBA to better estimate (particularly in the northern basin) low flow periods and rainfall runoff is important. Whilst recognised in this area, it doesn't mean it's incorrect, rather that further work has been identified.</p> <p>██████ has no issues, ██████ has explained well.</p>	<p>The Committee received and noted ██████████ Macquarie modelling report noting the concerns of The NSW Nature Conservation Council and The NSW Farmers Association from Budeko methodology; and lack of more comprehensive evidence to calibrate this model, high-lighting the associated outcomes changes to the IQQM.</p> <p>Moved ██████</p> <p>Seconded ██████</p>	

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
	<p>Endorse the DPIE Macquarie modelling – deferred to next meeting</p> <p>█ – raised M040 █ an increase of 5 GL of water and M053 – 3 GL of water is large scale change.</p> <p>█ – M040 - Threshold overbank flow would allow greater amount to property – probably occurring now. If not modelled now, then it would be incorrect. Can access at a lower threshold therefore probably taking more water than previously modelled. Larger proportion of water available assigned – not at CAP limit therefore can become a licence.</p> <p>Not due to change in IQQM rather the threshold.</p> <p>█ offered to identify which properties were affected by change to IQQM model.</p>	<p>█ offered to identify which properties were affected by change to IQQM model.</p>	<p>█</p>
12	Barwon-Darling – deferred to next meeting		
13	Unregulated – Groundwater █ and █ submission – █ requested committee to email him their response – deferred to next meeting if email not received.		
14	Other Business		
	Meeting close 2.00 pm		

## Next meeting

11 May 2021 via Microsoft Teams