

Details

Meeting: Meeting 51
Location: Via Teams
Date/time: 8:30am – 12.30am
13th October 2021
Chairperson: [REDACTED]

Committee

1. [REDACTED] - Independent Chair of the Healthy Floodplains Review Committee
2. [REDACTED] - Local Irrigator and landholder Moree
3. [REDACTED] - Nature Conservation and landholder Mudgee Council
4. [REDACTED] – NSW Farmers Association representative
5. [REDACTED] – alternate member (NSWFA)
6. [REDACTED] – advisory to the committee

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment – Water Group

1. [REDACTED] – Principal Project Officer, Licensing
2. [REDACTED] – Director, Healthy Floodplains
3. [REDACTED] – Manager Modelling
4. [REDACTED] – Acting Manager, Licensing and Approvals
5. [REDACTED] – Principal Water Regulation Officer
6. [REDACTED] - Senior Project Officer
7. [REDACTED] - Senior Project Officer
8. [REDACTED] – Project Officer

Apologies

1. [REDACTED] – Manager, Licensing and Approvals

This meeting

No.	Description	Action	Responsible
1	Meeting open Acknowledgement of country	[REDACTED]	Chair
2	Welcome from the Chair DPIE called committee members an hour before the start of each scheduled meeting.	DPIE to call committee members one hour before scheduled meeting	DPIE licensing staff

No.	Description	Action	Responsible
		start to confirm their attendance	
3	<p>Declaring conflict of interests.</p> <p>Nil declared.</p> <p>██████████ – Standing declaration - 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 be present for that part of meeting, ██████████ to chair that component.</p> <p>██████████ – Question why no one else has a standard declaration in place. Noted</p>		
4	Adoption of meeting 48 minutes dated 23 June 2021	<p>Minor errors fixed then adopted.</p> <p>Moved ██████████</p> <p>Seconded ██████████</p>	
5	<p>Adoption of meeting 49 minutes dated 28 June 2021</p> <p>██████████ – Questioned the year the committee was formed and the differences between the 2018 and the 2013 Sensing Methodology Policy Policies.</p> <p>██████████ – Things have not changed since 2013-2019.</p>	<p>Moved ██████████</p> <p>Seconded ██████████</p>	<p>██████████ Checking website for differing versions of the Policy.</p>
6	Adoption of meeting 50 minutes dated 30 September 2021	<p>Moved ██████████</p> <p>Seconded ██████████</p>	
7	<p>Discussion regarding Review Committee Reporting</p> <p>Committed to publish a summary report on everything we have done on Farm-scale validation process since March 2020.</p> <p>Committee was sent an email containing the final version which has been published on our website.</p> <p>Reviewed 404 submissions with about 1500 works or modelling issues embedded in that 404 submissions.</p>	██████████	
8	Briefing on the NSW Legislative Council inquiry onto Floodplain harvesting. There have been 4 hearings and the Standard Govt response to the process the govt has	<p>██████████ to</p> <p>Provide information to committee about LC</p>	<p>██████████</p> <p>Actioned – Information has</p>

No.	Description	Action	Responsible
	<p>approximately 6 months to respond to the final report and recommendations. Minister Pavey has indicated that she wants the support of the committee to build an amicable pathway forward through this critical water reform.</p> <p>█ – Interested to know how █ is aware that the committee was speaking with inquiry in closed sessions.</p> <p>█ – The information was made available by the secretariate.</p> <p>█ – I am interested in the protocol on how the Government deals with inquiries.</p>	<p>inquiry and govt protocol.</p>	<p>been provided to the committee via email 13-10-2021.</p>
9	<p>Barwon Darling and Namoi Modelling. █ left the meeting and █ chaired the item.</p> <p>Spending the last months reviewing the Barwon Darling modelling process. The valley has a few extra properties that were ineligible are now eligible.</p> <p>We have addressed the questions raised by the review committee earlier are there any outstanding issues.</p> <p>█ - How are their eligible works added at this late stage? Can we obtain an updated version of the submissions report?</p> <p>█ – Brought together the eligible works data and the floodplain harvesting models suggested there was some inconsistencies, so we further investigated them, and 2 additional properties were eligible for floodplain harvesting.</p> <p>█ – No queries, if a property was marked ineligible, however moved banks etc are they now marked as eligible.</p> <p>█ – If NRAR defined something as eligible we included that in the modelling.</p> <p>█ – I had a session with █ and raised a few contradictions in the draft version.</p> <p>█ – Reminded the committee its role is not to critique their model and reports. The role is around the submissions and making sure the changes we've made in response to submissions is right. The primary documents are the submissions summary document and the most up to date version.</p>	<p>█ and █ to provide clarification with those submissions summaries and provide an updated report for the next committee meeting.</p> <p>█ – Everyone is to deal with this information offline prior to the next meeting so that everyone has agreed on their position prior to us meeting next.</p>	<p>█ and █.</p>
9a.	<p>█ returned to Chair the remainder of the meeting.</p>		

No.	Description	Action	Responsible
	<p>Namoi – Brand new model as the Dept took on a broader review. Through the farm-scale validation process and the newly assembled Namoi source model. Moving away from the IQQM to a brand-new model than we have done for the other valleys.</p> <p>In addition to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] we're bringing in a third reviewer. Workshops will be beginning with stakeholder in Namoi and other valleys further downstream.</p> <p>That process will go on for a further 4 weeks in 4 separate stages.</p> <p>Expecting a revised assessment and will recirculate that to the committee.</p> <p>[REDACTED] – What will be the timeframe? How are the unregulated properties fitting in with the modelling?</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Timeframe early December or late November. Unregulated properties aren't simulated in the valley scale model and will be dealt with by a separate process.</p> <p>[REDACTED] – The 93- 99 so I'm just wondering how the calculation of floodplain harvesting in the Namoi with a high level of unregulated floodplain harvesting compared to the other valleys. How that's going to work in your cap calculations?</p> <p>[REDACTED] - Volumetric conversion process is the maximum area by the average crop right between 93 and 99. But the actual cap volume relates to the average volume that was taken between 93 to 99 so that they're two separate things. The licenses and if you add up all of the share components for the licences based on maximums that isn't the CAP for the unregulated system, it's the average.</p>		
10	<p>Macquarie Modelling – In addition of modelling submissions, temporary storage and how the rainfall runoff in undeveloped areas.</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Rainfall runoff modelling. Seems to be a low-level confidence in the way of assessing things.</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Consistent across process across the valleys and it will take a few years of data and a review of the modelling once we have sufficient floodplain harvesting meters in use.</p>	<p>[REDACTED] – [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to work together, include the temporary storages and [REDACTED] to provide final advice to the committee for review.</p>	

No.	Description	Action	Responsible
	<p>█ – World first venture with a tender placed out to develop the method and collect data and incorporating that into our river system models.</p> <p>█ – Suggested that it includes temporary storage.</p>		
11	<p>N068 █ contested submission.</p> <p>█ – Issues 3 & 4 - remain unchanged - nominal rates used due to the varying heights during flooding. To remain consistent with those determined in other valleys.</p> <p>█ – I concur with █.</p> <p>█ – Happy with the nominal rates.</p> <p>█ – Yes fair with nominal rates.</p>	<p>Determination - that Issue 3 and Issue 4 Committee remains unchanged. Issues 7 & 8 █ remains unchanged as it failed to meet the eligible works test.</p>	
12	<p>N080 █</p> <p>█ – I have asked for further information from the applicant.</p>	<p>█ to have submission back to █ by the 22/10/2021</p>	
13	<p>N108 █</p> <p>█ – Will have to double check the figures on this one. Requires the hectares claimed based on field sizes. Not included in the submission.</p> <p>█ – Can you prioritise this one █?</p>	<p>█ to get the hectares delineated and sent to the committee by end of this week.</p>	<p>█ – completed</p>
14	<p>N049 █</p> <p>█ would like further data same reason as N108</p>		<p>█ - completed</p>
15	<p>G018 █</p> <p>Recommendation █ is not eligible for any additional floodplain harvesting based on original determination.</p> <p>█ – Leave it as is.</p> <p>█ – I support that.</p>	<p>Determination – that █ is not eligible for any additional floodplain harvesting draft entitlement.</p>	
16	Other Business		
17	Meeting close 10.36am		

Next meeting

27th October 2021