

Details

Meeting: Healthy Floodplains Review Committee Meeting

Location: Microsoft Teams

Date/time: Wednesday 11 May 2021
8.30am – 10.30am

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], Project Officer (minutes)
12. [REDACTED], Senior Project Officer

This meeting

	Issue	Action	Responsible
	Meeting open 8.30am		
	<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	
	Adoption of minutes dated 6 May 2021.	Deferred to next meeting.	

Endorsement DPIE W Modelling Macquarie results for 27 properties.

██████

At previous meeting previous ██████ asked which properties were affected by the changes in temporary storage.

██████ explained the changes to the IQQM software was a program 'bug' where properties with temporary storage had a negative balance then reset to zero which stopped flows going through to the storage. Applied across any property that had temporary storage, not just those that had made a submission. It had not occurred in the Gwidir model, just the Macquarie.

The farm validation process allowed the property owner to make submission and provide evidence that the modeller checked against evidence lines and back traced to model. Temporary storage was not working correctly in the modelling, wasn't consistent with other lines of evidence that the farmer had used that water before.

██████ - Is there clarity around those lines of evidence?

██████ - Yes in the Macquarie model build report.

██████ Lower Macquarie effluent creeks? How the modelling adopts process for the system?

Process is in the model build report.

██████ – Review included key points based on Irrigator stakeholders in meetings in July 2020, Environmental stakeholders in October 2020, key points were raised and therefore considered in checking. Checked that it was a fair and equitable process by Department in analysis and then check results in tables that have been made in modelling and NRAR.

██████ - Did not meet with NSW Farmers.

██████ - Offered 5-6 weeks ago had opportunity to meet with you, but no points sent.

██████ – ██████ is doing analysis on the committee's behalf, he is the technical expert for the committee.

Deferred to next meeting

██████ – still does not understand effluent creek.

██████ - Submissions analysis and modelling in Macquarie – identified in Macquarie and properties that benefit where effluent Namoi and Macquarie – Modellers thresholds of access are lower than in the model based of several properties providing evidence. Mostly refers to Namoi. Breakout is allowed for in model, then provides water that satisfy crop by demands from satellites, crop evidence requirements via satellite. Where it is taken up, it is limited by flow threshold at breakout point of by use of gauges nearby.

Interested in unreg and reg creeks.

██████ - Unreg and Reg access – The Water Sharing Plan rules set the hierarchy of use rules that are used in the model.

Overarching themes used to review modelling around particular issues identified – eg threshold changes, not every detail. Checking that multiple lines of evidence

Often farmer evidence is not as fine grained as the Departments modeller use – they use 2 or 3 lines of evidence but use fine scale on ground information but can be beneficial for checking.

██████ would appreciate any further information to support decisions, particularly the Macquarie, seeking to understand

██████ to make Macquarie Build report available. – Actioned in SharePoint PUB21-181

██████ as accurate as possible, great level of detail would be happy to support.

██████ agrees.

██████ – 5GL change to flood runner.

██████ – was it the size of flood runner or changes to intake – additional temporary storage. 052 – 3 GL large change to intake – is it flood runner or temporary storage change?

██████ – to clarify IQQM bug and temp storage make very little difference, temp storage 5% overbank flow. Field may be flooded for 2 weeks

and taking water to storage – and temp storage take, only for a 2-week window.

██████████ – threshold overbank flow decreases – farmer accessing a lower level than model. Now model will consider. Doesn't mean that farmer is accessing the water.

Hydraulic model – where flooding occurs based on river channel and where floods landscape.

Modellers used hydraulic model, satellite image, and Water NSW information said about ██████████ and then more consistent with the 3 lines of evidence provided by landholder: of when flooding, graphs, weir then checked against 3 other lines of evidence: Hydrology model, Water NSW information and satellite image and found to be consistent.

██████████ – reminded committee of lines of evidence, reviewed by ██████████.

██████████ – not seeing all the detailed lines of evidence that the modeller uses.

██████████ has reviewed on behalf of committee.

Modelling Hydraulic for flood protection done in 2008 used and other parameters added (refer to Flood Plain Management Plan 2008).

There is one model built but run for different scenarios. Other verification used usually satellite images, model calibration – upstream and downstream of gauges. Developed over years using as much information as possible.

██████████ request information if the committee would like him to focus on.

██████████ – Did not endorse Border Rivers or Gwydir, appreciates the work from ██████████ but cannot endorse the Macquarie model.

██████████ Have you seen the models?

██████████ – Yes reviewed for technical accuracy and competencies. Have looked at Gwydir, Border Rivers, Namoi – has seen the models as part of the review. Macquarie wasn't developed fully at that time, but where models have been built have undertaken technical peer review prior to ██████████ and ██████████ reviewing. ██████████ looks at lines of evidence and what are concerns of stakeholders.

█ requests that █ provide dot points to clearly articulate why █ will not endorse the process that the Department has undertaken the correct procedures, and █ has endorsed. What other information does the Department need to provide?

█ – Reminded the committee. The Department has received 27 modelling submissions, The Department has reviewed. Not asking you to review the model, asking that the submissions have been responded to correctly, noting █ has done review and endorsed.

Discussion on modelling property

█ questioned M049

█ – explained that when eligible storage went down, previously able to access overbank flows. While long term goes up slightly, it's how storage can fill from rainfall runoff first. Reduced volume but how that storage works and it's a small storage 200ML storage.

█ - M056 – significant change intake. 290ML overall increase over 5 year

█ - Volume eligible storage and rate of take. Rainfall runoff is generally used first for take then overbank flow for floodplain harvesting.

█ - M052 – Flood runner large overbank flow, then rainfall runoff lower

█ – Flood runner is responsible for increase. Local area runoff/rainfall runoff then.

█ – significant increase with 1000Ha increase in developed area.

█ - Based on NRAR analysis of what is developed area, part of farm scale validation process Department has used multiple lines of evidence. Tony has checked.

█ – Where one property makes submission on a flood runner-after modellers check and if approved does it benefit the other properties that are affected, hasn't made a submission and there was a change. Do other properties automatically occur.

█ - Yes.

█ to provide dot points to clearly articulate she will not endorse the process that the Department has undertaken for the Macquarie modelling.

Committee decision:

Committee receives and notes the paper - Recommendations to Review Committee submission post farm scale validation letters Macquarie Modelling paper for the 27 properties as presented to committee.

█ - supports

█ – support

█ - cannot agree, needs to go and review the Macquarie model build reports. Would like to email comments to █ and allow response. Reserves right to endorse out of session and let committee know.

█ – supports - qualified agreement on basis the wants to read modelling build report and themes paper. Follow up with email if concerns.

Healthy Floodplains Review Committee



Meeting 45 minutes dated 11 May 2021

	Issue	Action	Responsible
	<p>Downstream properties may not have made a submission as may match their property records, if there was additional water available, they may not have the storage to capture.</p> <p>█ thanked all for time on discussion.</p>		
	<p>Outstanding submission determination – █ N080 █ deferred to next meeting</p>	<p>█ requests clearer photograph of pump plates.</p> <p>█ requests that █ determine out of session once further information received.</p>	
	<p>Outstanding submission determination – █ N144 █ deferred to next meeting</p>	<p>█ requests that █ determine out of session once further information received.</p>	
	<p>Unregulated – Groundwater █ and █ submission</p>	<p>█ – does not support add to Dep Sec letter, will █ email █ to advise.</p> <p>█ endorsed as in line with other decisions for other landholders.</p> <p>█ endorsed</p> <p>█ supports.</p>	
	<p>Retraction of Groundwater and Unregulated properties endorsement by █</p>	<p>Noted by committee</p>	
	<p>Barwon-Darling modelling – deferred to next meeting</p>		
	<p>Other Business – █ has requested letter from committee for the █ query.</p> <p>Namoi – rebuild model to source but █ has indicated that it should not hold up the modelling results for submissions to committee.</p> <p>Will Namoi change to source model have an effect on the Barwon-Darling model?</p>	<p>DPIE to draft letter and circulate to committee</p> <p>█ to provide information to committee.</p>	

	Issue	Action	Responsible
	Meeting close 10.30 am		

Next meeting

18 May 2021 via Microsoft Teams