

Details

Meeting: Healthy Floodplains Review Committee

Location: Teleconference

Date/time: Tuesday 18 May 2021
8.30am – 10.00am

Chairperson: [REDACTED]

People Present

Committee:

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

Guests:

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

Apologies

[REDACTED], Director Healthy Floodplains Project, DPIE

[REDACTED], Manager Floodplain Harvesting

[REDACTED], Senior Project Officer

DPIE-Water Healthy Floodplains:

7. [REDACTED], Principal Project Officer
8. [REDACTED], Senior Project Officer
9. [REDACTED], Senior Project Officer
10. [REDACTED] Project Officer (minutes)

This meeting

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
1	Meeting open	██████████ welcomed all and noted attendance / apologies.	Chair
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 be present for that part of meeting, ██████████ to chair that component.</p>	Noted	
2	<p>Adoption of meeting 44 minutes dated 6 May 2021</p> <p>██████████ confirmed that he had checked with modellers regarding which specific properties were affected by the minor model change. The change was then applied to any model property that had temporary storage as allowance was negative – taking water away where didn't exist. Only occurred over very small time period and did not make a significant impact to results. To interrogate further would be through each of the hundreds of properties.</p>	<p>Moved ██████████</p> <p>Seconded ██████████</p>	
3	Adoption of meeting 45 minutes dated 11 May 2021	<p>Minor errors fixed then adopted.</p> <p>Moved ██████████</p> <p>Seconded ██████████</p>	

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
4	<p>Business arising from meeting 45</p> <p>██████ requests meeting with ██████ to seek information regarding modelling.</p>	<p>██████ to meet with ██████ and ██████ and next week.</p> <p>██████ requests return email from ██████ and ██████ – ‘receiving and noting modelling’ after meeting with ██████</p> <p>N080 ██████ – owners considering requesting nominal rates for pumps to finalise N144 ██████</p>	<p>██████ – actioned meeting held 24 May 2020</p> <p>██████ and ██████</p> <p>██████ to send through submissions to ██████</p>

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
5	<p>Receive and note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information on Building the river system model for the model Macquarie Valley regulated river PUB21_181 - Floodplain harvesting entitlements for the Macquarie Valley regulated river system - ██████ emailed committee his summary report from meeting with irrigation landholders and environmental groups stakeholder farm scale to explain to ██████ what items that ██████ included when assessing model build reports. 	<p>Moved ██████ Seconded ██████ Noted ██████</p> <p>Moved ██████ Seconded ██████ Noted ██████</p> <p>Moved ██████ Seconded ██████</p>	
6	<p>Barwon-Darling Modelling Report – ██████</p> <p>██████ left the meeting for this item and ██████ chaired the meeting</p>		

██████
In Dec reviewed submissions there were some overarching issues, model was very well-done with good lines of evidence but needed better documentation. DPIE then presented updated information to ██████.

In Feb – revised submissions received, and ██████ raised questions based on assessment and discussions with ██████ and the Wentworth Group eg modelled flows vs observed flows at Mungindi. Modellers provided written response (attached to ██████ report).

Investigated how inflows were handled coming into model. QLD uses different approach to take, assumes full entitlement is used on Border Rivers – NSW models using crop demand etc. Therefore, modelled less 10% lower on average water available for areas near Mungindi. NSW used observed data. If full entitlement used in QLD then amount would be less. Whilst in NSW, a property could theoretically get a higher entitlement, this approach has a better ability to understand the actual river take rather than underestimating; and can be adjusted to meet the Basin CAP and long-term average annual extraction limit.

The Barwon-Darling contains landscapes that are arid and there is limited information about how runoff in arid areas is converted to rainfall runoff, therefore the model used data from similar arid landscapes and soils in QLD for that component of the model. The information was compared for expected arid lands (Neuman paper). Used the best available data in the Barwon-Darling, 1.7% rainfall is converted to runoff.

Barwon–Darling – The A, B or C licence category allocation is done first in the model. The FPH occurs close to river channel itself, does not break out like other valleys. The landholder may take C class licence then not have any capacity for FPH.

██████ – Filled storages using Class C licence – reduces entitlement?

██████ - Yes

██████ - Question about rainfall runoff being changed based on QLD landscape?

██████ - Rainfall runoff revised downwards in most cases.

██████ - Very good explanation – commended ██████ professionalism and helped him understand the modelling.

██████ – Questioned simpler approach cease to flow pump to river flow?

██████ – In other rivers FPH is determined by volumes of break out and what farms access, pumped into storage and crop usage based on properties where break out occurs and included effluent creeks, flood runners. Barwon-Darling is different; FPH occurring from main river channel. Water take from Licence A,B,C, stock and domestic are all considered together. FPH considered after other considerations – what does farm need, the way access and approved storage availability. It is simpler to model.

Model build report – satisfied that later period, long term 114 years ok, but later (2008) in latest years – ██████ has raised point with modellors. Doesn't affect how modelling submissions are evaluated. Will have effect on current level of take.

██████ – If there is a change will it affect the modelling individual draft model allocations that they are being asked to endorse?

██████ – Yes there may be but not significant, more about format to make easier to read.

██████ cannot endorse the 14 until model build report finalised.

██████ - The assessment and approach would be the same, numbers may move very slightly.

██████ – Committee is not being asked to endorse the entitlement, landholders have made submission of modelling parameters. The changes to modelling parameters is what the committee is being asked to endorse.

██████ – Committee: submission from landholder on modelling - Do you agree that the department has used the evidence provided, updates to NRAR databases and results on agreed parameters – being asked to endorse the analysis noting that numbers may change slightly.

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
	<p>█████ – (and NSW Nature Conservation) has concerns about inconsistencies across each models and the input into the Barwon-Darling model.</p> <p>█████ – recent models modelled the FPH more explicitly than the earlier models, however each valley has the same amount of water entering their model, the Barwon-Darling still has the similar amount of water entering the system either way (based on lower gauges).</p> <p>█████ – Has there been consistency in the approach to analysing the submission in all valleys?</p> <p>█████ -Yes</p> <p>█████ – Endorsed. Has updated farmers information, 2008 level of storage, flood runners, area irrigated, have been updated, fed into model, experts review happy to endorse with best evidence available. Models will evolve as further information becomes available.</p> <p>█████ – wants to wait until discussion with █████</p> <p>█████ –requests committee maintain focus on task at hand, scope of committee.</p> <p>█████ and █████ asked █████ specifics on several properties.</p> <p>█████ left the meeting at 10.15am.</p>	<p>█████ endorsed the Barwon-Darling modelling report</p>	
7	<p>█████ joined the meeting</p> <p>█████ joined the meeting</p> <p>Submission Outcomes</p> <p>Submission N123 █████ – 600ML storage.</p>	<p>█████ to send through image of storage (showing existing storage and new storage built).</p> <p>Committee to advise decision by return email.</p> <p>█████ endorsed via email 18 May 2021</p> <p>█████ endorsed in meeting.</p>	

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
8	<p>Other Business</p> <p>Revision of Namoi model will take 6-8 weeks.</p> <p>█████ Interested on the impact of model changes on the Namoi modelling review and committee notification of changes.</p> <p>██████████████ to meet with █████ and █████ and other committee members if required</p> <p>Next meeting - Barwon Darling endorsement. █████ does not need to attend next meeting as has endorsed</p>	<p>DPIE set meeting with █████</p>	<p>Actioned - meeting held 25 May 2020</p>

Meeting closed

11.00pm

Next meeting

27 May 2021 – Teams Meeting