

Details

Meeting: Meeting 53
Location: via Teams
Date/time: 10am -12pm
11 February 2022
Chairperson: [REDACTED]

People present

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). (joined occasionally while [REDACTED] had to attend to media matters)
6. [REDACTED] – advisory to the committee

Department of Planning and Environment – Water Group

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

Apologies

Nil



Previous meeting

Action	Responsible	Status
1. Non-consensus brief to be prepared by the department for review by the Chief Executive Officer – Water (formerly the Deputy Secretary – Water)	DPE	
2. Reports to be provided to DPE from HFPRC members for inclusion in non-consensus brief		
<p>In relation to item 5, Clarification of the audit process for FPH water supply work approvals</p> <p>The HFPRC received and noted clarification of the audit process the department has adopted for reassessment of eligible works and that will apply to submissions received for consideration of the HFPRC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Audit process for FPH Water Supply Work Approvals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1a. Audit of FPH works to confirm eligibility 1b. Audit process – further clarification 	Moved: [REDACTED] Seconded: [REDACTED]	
Ensure representation of the views of all members in the recommendation reports that go to the Minister’s departmental delegate.	[REDACTED]	

This meeting

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
1	Acknowledgement of country		██████████
2	Welcome from the Chair		██████████
3	Declaring conflicts of interest for this meeting	██████████ standing declaration.	██████████
4	Endorsement of draft minutes from Meeting 52 and action status	██████████ moved. ██████████ seconded. Non-consensus reports were lodged by ██████████ and ██████████.	██████████
5	Submissions on eligible works audit for the Border Rivers and Gwydir; and Clarification of the audit process for FPH water supply work approvals	██████████ expressed concerns about the reasons for some denials of eligibility.	

Confirmation of audit process

██████████ confirmed the audit process will apply to all eligible works in all 5 northern valleys, with focus on both regulated and unregulated systems.

For criteria a) and b) of the Reg, the works must be fully constructed. Under criteria c), if there is a pending application that hadn't been determined at 3 July 2008, a work may be partially constructed or construction had not yet commenced, to be eligible.

If something could be approved in the future, was not considered in terms of criteria c).

██████████ explained that the eligibility criteria in the Reg amendment, particularly criteria c) is barely changed from the Policy and earlier Reg version that was disallowed. The audit process was provided to the HFPRC for information only. It does not require endorsement from HFPRC. The remit of the HFPRC is limited to review of the assessment recommendations.

Submissions received are the result of the audit process that has been applied in response to the amended criteria in the Reg.

The Reg amendment that comes into effect on Monday 14 February 2022, moves what was a policy position into law.

Further questions about the audit process may be submitted out of session, by separate email so the HFPRC can focus on agenda items.

██████████ believes the legislation unfair where existing works have not previously been identified by the department over many years and are just recently being deemed ineligible and impacting allocations. Most of the current submissions before the committee relate to issues with lot numbers and just the storage has been built outside of lot numbers and just the paperwork hasn't been tidied up and its been overlooked by both the landholders and by the department. The landholders have tried to do everything right and there has been lots of correspondence with the department over a long period of time. They have the department on their land and checked over things and no issues were identified. They have been irrigating for 20 odd years or more and these issues have just been picked up. These matters could have been brought up when everybody had a face to face meeting about their eligibility. Landholders are losing faith in the department. They thought they had a future and certainty and now they don't have that.



No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
		<p>██████████ is disappointed with the department, as the process was something that he has been reasonably proud of. Things were probably left off. There are now different rules and regulations that keep getting changed. In the long run this is probably for the better and models will have better information in them.</p> <p>He noted landholder frustration with the second audit process and lack of clarity in the decisions made and communicated.</p> <p>██████████ confirmed this is the most extensive, detailed assessment done. The department must ensure the Minister or their delegate can make informed decisions that are based on as complete evidence as possible.</p> <p>A small number of works will have entitlement reduced or have been determined as ineligible.</p> <p>██████████ provided a status update on progress of the audit to date. The process for Border Rivers and Gwydir is complete. The internal audit process is complete and the submission process underway for Macquarie. The internal process is nearing completion for the Namoi and Barwon Darling but results not yet communicated to those landholders.</p> <p>Submissions at today’s meeting relate to Border and Gwydir.</p> <p>The Chair requested any further questions be submitted in writing to staff prior to meetings so that responses can be prepared with notice.</p> <p>██████████ commented on usage rates and other factors that are considered in modelling that may result in amended entitlements.</p>	



No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
	<p>1st submission – [REDACTED] (G079)</p>	<p>[REDACTED] stepped in for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] confirmed for [REDACTED] that the construction had not commenced by 2013 but was underway.</p> <p>[REDACTED] endorsed the recommendation [REDACTED] endorsed the recommendation [REDACTED] endorsed the recommendation [REDACTED] endorsed the recommendation</p> <p>The HFPRC recommended support for the department’s interpretation of clause 23B of the WM Regulation.</p>	

2nd submission (G106)

██████████ endorsed the recommendation

██████████ endorsed the department's recommendation.

██████████ endorsed the department's recommendation.

██████████ endorsed DPE recommendation, noting concerns around the fairness of the legislation.

Recommendation contained on p3 of G106 is the recommendation of the HFPRC.

██████████ committed to representing ██████████ views in the recommendation report that goes to the delegate of the Minister.

Detailed discussion of the concerns followed.

██████████ clarified the WM Gen Reg eligibility criteria. The ROIs were assessed and there is no evidence to prove the structures on the property comply with the law. The storage is therefore not eligible.

In the Reg eligibility criteria, works capable of flood plain harvesting refers to fully constructed, not partially built.

██████████ confirmed the work is now approved and can be used, it is only the allocation that has been impacted by the assessment decision.

██████████ confirmed landholders may appeal decisions through the Land and Environment Court.

██████████ referred to a fact sheet that describes the assessment process applied to the works when they were constructed during 1990s. Detailed hydro assessment is now required in the current works assessment process.

██████████ clarified that the applicant built the structure outside the terms of the part 8 approval and they were beyond the lot boundary.

██████████ clarified that the reason for non-consensus, required by the terms of reference for the HFPRC needs to be on the basis that the eligibility criteria have been applied incorrectly. None of the comments or issues raised align with the requirement to lodge a non-consensus.

Healthy Floodplains Review Committee

Meeting 53 minutes



No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
		<p>None of the issues raised in the submission address any of the three eligibility criteria.</p> <p>██████████ suggested comments on the merit of the law could be taken up through the Irrigators Council or directly with the Minister.</p> <p>He advised the department could not provide assistance or advocacy through the HFPRC to separately support members to pursue such matters.</p> <p>The Minister applying any exemption by their discretion would not be a legal decision.</p>	
	<p>3rd submission (G117) FPH 3,4,7,8</p>	<p>██████████ endorsed the department recommendation.</p> <p>██████████ endorsed the department recommendation.</p> <p>██████████ endorses the recommendation of the department.</p> <p>██████████ endorsed the DPE recommendation, noting concerns, similar to the issues discussed for earlier submissions.</p>	



No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
6	<p>Barwon-Darling and Macquarie modelling submissions</p>	<p>██████████ addressed a number of modelling submissions that have been unresolved by HFPRC for over 12 months. To streamline the process to achieve resolution, all changes and recommendations have been summarised for members to nominate their approval or otherwise by COB next Friday. (see the documents titled Barwon-Darling summaries for endorsement and Macquarie summaries for endorsement)</p> <p>Any that require further information or non-consensus reports will be progressed separately.</p> <p>██████████ confirmed the modelling process has been redrafted. HFPRC’s remit is to consider the department’s recommendations that result from the modelling.</p> <p>Information about modelling was provided at the request of the HFPRC to clarify understanding. It does not require input or endorsement of the HFPRC; just review of the changes that are proposed in response to the modelling process.</p> <p>██████████ confirmed that modelling changes intended for Macquarie and Barwon Darling will impact recommendations to the HFPRC.</p>	

<p>7 Barwon-Darling and Macquarie modelling submissions</p> <p>Refer to Barwon-Darling summaries attachment for endorsement details</p> <p>Action: Department to resend BD submission summaries and original submissions to members again for those with question marks and [REDACTED].</p> <p>Refer to Macquarie summaries attachment for endorsement details</p>	<p>[REDACTED] offered to meet again next Friday to progress remaining decisions.</p> <p>[REDACTED] requested the following points be recorded: Information sessions with modellers out of session were not recorded. It is time consuming to go back through previous meeting records and documents to review and make decisions. In some cases, she found various documents that she feels decisions had already been made.</p> <p>[REDACTED] lodged a non-consensus report in July that outlined issues with the Barwon Darling and Macquarie model decisions.</p> <p>[REDACTED] commented that decision making out of session have not been as rigorous as in a committee meeting.</p> <p>M004 – [REDACTED]</p> <p>Claim that model has grossly underestimated overbank flow harvesting and overestimates rainfall runoff harvesting</p> <p>Action: Department to resend submissions summaries and original submissions to members again for this ROI.</p> <p>Re M017 – [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] queried where the increased figures come from.</p> <p>Action: Department to resend submission summaries and original submissions to members again for this ROI.</p> <p>M018,M019,M020 – [REDACTED]</p> <p>Claims the developed area in the model is underestimated leading to an underestimation in rainfall runoff harvesting.</p> <p>[REDACTED] thinks the calculations are incorrect.</p> <p>Action: Chair requested this be clarified in discussions with the department out of session.</p> <p>M029 – [REDACTED]</p>
--	--

█████ advised that WNSW confirmed a board is removed at certain flow rates and this wasn't taken into account in initial modelling. When this was taken into account, the modellers got a different result.

M030 – ██████

Claims modelling underestimates overbank flow harvesting due to the absence of some large pipes in the hydraulic modelling.

Action: Department to provide further information out of session about where the pipes came from that changed intake rate.

M031 – ██████

Action: ██████ to provide more information on output.

M040 – ██████

Action: ██████ agreed with DPE recommendation, with the caveat that supporting information/evidence is provided.

M049 - ██████

Action: ██████ agreed with DPE recommendation, with the caveat that supporting information/evidence is provided.

M052 – ██████

Action: ██████ agreed with DPE recommendation, with the caveat that supporting information/evidence is provided.

M057 - ██████

Action: Department to provide more information.

M070 – ██████

Updating developed and undeveloped areas

Action: ██████ to double check that LIDAR supports the satellite imagery evidence for this ROI.

No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
		<p>Action: [redacted] to confirm that just the undeveloped area component is recommended for amendment and provide an actual area, rather than an estimate.</p> <p>Action: Department to recirculate information relevant for this submission.</p> <p>M077 – [redacted]</p> <p>Action: [redacted] to provide evidence for a definite measurement of crop area.</p> <p>M085 – [redacted]</p> <p>Action: [redacted] to confirm information for [redacted] and [redacted] re consistent decision making with M060.</p> <p>M095 – [redacted]</p> <p>Action: [redacted] to circulate satellite imagery and/or hydraulic modelling evidence to Members of the height at which those works get water or the rate that they take water to account for the significant change.</p> <p>M098 – [redacted]</p> <p>[redacted] confirmed some information comes from IBQs and then satellite imagery can be quite different.</p> <p>Action: [redacted] to confirm the developed area and for what year it applies.</p> <p>M113 – [redacted]</p> <p>[redacted] query info not provided to previous questions.</p> <p>Action: [redacted] to provide information about the basis for determining developed area.</p> <p>[redacted] confirmed all requested information can be provided by Wednesday, so that the HFPRC can finalise decisions by Friday 18 February 2022.</p>	

Healthy Floodplains Review Committee

Meeting 53 minutes



No.	Issue	Action	Responsible
8	Scope of work for the HFPRC in 2022	<p>Action: Confirm definite meeting dates for April, May, June 2022.</p> <p>Next meeting 14 March 2022 (Macquarie submissions will be on the agenda)</p>	[REDACTED]
9	<p>Other business</p> <p>Correspondence re N068</p> <p>Consideration of seeking legal opinion</p>	<p>[REDACTED] noted that submission N068 does not relate to his standing declaration of non-pecuniary interest re TCS related items.</p> <p>[REDACTED] summarised issued addressed by the correspondence from TCS.</p> <p>Members agreed this case needs to be treated consistently with other cases.</p> <p>Action: Members requested [REDACTED] to seek clarification about modelling impacts and provide this information out of session by Wednesday 16 February 2022.</p> <p>Members discussed seeking separate legal opinion to provide assurance that HFPRC has followed proper process and applied procedural fairness in its decision-making and to protect and support members. Such a review could consider out of session arrangements and provide guidance for members to manage non-disclosure where they wish to pursue matters through their representative bodies.</p> <p>Members referenced previous audits.</p> <p>The Chair will discuss with [REDACTED] off-line.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>request [REDACTED]</p>
10	Meeting close		

Next meeting

10am -12pm Monday 14 March 2022.

					Changes endorsed by committee			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
BD003		Flow from Mungaroo and Sparks Warrambools (high level effluent channels from the Moonie and Barwon Rivers that also have some catchment of their own) reach the back of Ulah station and provide floodplain harvesting access.	FPH CTP for the Homestead lagoon be revised to 16,600ML	Modelling and Landsat imagery that showed breakout water entering the Homestead lagoon.	y	N*	y	y
		Inflow from the Big Warrambool and Narran back up Barwon-Darling and provide access.	The rainfall runoff contribution from Mungaroo and Sparks Warrambools is represented in the model.	Satellite imagery shows water breakout around field 10 and two sources of water contributing to the water at the back of Ulah. Used hydraulic modelling to calculate flow. Tuflow modelling. AWBM developed to estimate rainfall runoff contribution validated against landholder journal entries and DPE spatial analysis.	y	N*	y	y
		Requesting surge area	Surge area D and E be adopted and	Satellite imagery using Landsat 7 (Feb 2012),	y	N*	y	?

					Changes endorsed by committee			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
			modelled as temporary surge.	analysis of flood channels surrounding surge area D.				
		Requesting additional field storage (Field 10)	Additional field storage (Field 10) not be adopted.	No evidence from landholder and past use and analysis of satellite imagery does not support past uses of relevant fields as temporary storages.	y	y	y	y
BD008_ BD009		Requests the use of the climate station [redacted] in lieu of [redacted]	No change	BD008/009 is closer in proximity to climate station [redacted] (48km away) than climate station [redacted] (78km).	y	y	y	y
BD010		Developed area size 380 Ha in lieu of 530 Ha	Decrease the irrigable area from 530 Ha to 380 Ha	The developed area was re-estimated using aerial imagery and indicates that the combination of irrigated areas add up to approximately 380 Ha	y	y	y	y

					Changes endorsed by committee			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
		Climate station [REDACTED] in lieu of [REDACTED]	No change	BD010 is closer in proximity to climate station [REDACTED] (60km away) than climate station [REDACTED] (70km).	y	y	y	y
BD020	[REDACTED]	Contesting floodplain harvesting intake of 193ML/day. Requesting inclusion of intake from billabong and temporary storages	Increase the total intake capacity from 193ML/d to 310ML/d.	Pump rate of 193ML/d into OFS1 and OFS2 storages is correct and agreed by landholders. Land holder confirms that OBF comes to one point in the lagoon and does fill from the river. The pipe capacity of #11 is 1200mm = 117ML/d. Change the total intake pump capacity to 193+117= 310ML/d.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Contesting rainfall runoff figures	Amend the rainfall – runoff contribution from the local regional catchment to 5.7%.	AWBM model was developed to estimate the rainfall runoff from the catchment area, calibrated against the anecdotal evidence of two rainfall runoff events in 2011 and	y	N*	y	n

					Changes endorsed by committee			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
				2016 provided by the landholder.				
		Requesting temporary storage (North)	No change	Satellite imagery (Landsat 8 from Feb 2020) and surge area (Landsat 7 from Feb 2012), volumes calculated by DPE Water using ArcGIS.	y	y	y	y
		Requesting field storages (C2,3,7,8)	No change	No evidence that C7 and C8 are used during flood events	y	y	y	y
		Requesting surge area (86.85ML)	No change	No evidence that surge area is used during flood events	y	y	y	y
BD022		Contesting the FPH commence pump to threshold of 13,000ML from the Mehi River take point used in modelling	Change of FPH CTP from 13,000ML/d to the Mehi commence to pump threshold of 6,320ML/d.	Bank height analysis using LIDAR for Mehi overflows, photos and nearby Mehi gauge thresholds.	y	N*	y	?

					Changes endorsed by committee			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
BD023		Contesting 'commence to pump' volumes at Brewarrina.	Changes to FPH CTP from 30,000ML/d to 12,500ML/d at Brewarrina.	Photographs, aerial imagery and Landsat 5 satellite imagery analysis.	y	N*	y	?
BD026		Contesting annual floodplain harvesting based on long-term average basis.	No change.	DPE advice that the flow threshold for Little Weir River take has been artificially reduced from 4,330ML/d to 100ML/d due to an unauthorised river channel incision. Accordingly, the overbank flow threshold from the Little Weir River for the 2008/2009 eligible scenario will be retained at 4,330 ML/day.	y	y	y	y
BD028_ BD029_ BD030		Querying of modelling results	Change to the licence entitlement for BD030	Model corrected on the basis of a review of WLS licence information for BD030.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

* non-consensus report received.

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
M004		Claim that model has grossly underestimates overbank flow harvesting and overestimates rainfall runoff harvesting	Moving the overbank flow access to the Bulgeraga Creek flood runner.	Review of satellite imagery and hydraulic modelling.	y	N*	y	?
		Request to change the climate station	Requested change should not be made.	Original climate station is much closer to this property, per previous advice to the Review Committee and in line with all modelling.	y	y	y	y
M017		Claims modelling underestimates rainfall runoff plus overbank flow harvesting due to an underestimated developed area.	Developed area changed from 12310ha to 13884ha	Based on review of satellite imagery of nominated developed areas, eligible storage volume, nominated planted areas and recorded general security extractions.	y	N*	y	?
		Claims modelling underestimates rainfall runoff plus overbank flow harvesting due to an underestimated developed area.	No change to rainfall runoff parameters or overbank harvesting statistics	Review of satellite imagery of nominated developed areas, eligible storage volume, nominated planted areas and recorded general security extractions.	y	y	y	y

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
M018, M019 & M020		Claims the developed area in the model is underestimated leading to an underestimation in rainfall runoff harvesting.	Updates to developed area and undeveloped area	A review of satellite imagery indicates that the nominated developed area of 5,934ha cannot be reconciled with the observed satellite data, but that an increase in the maximum developed area 3,200ha is reasonable and should be adopted. It seems that the area nominated by the landholder includes both developed and undeveloped area and therefore the undeveloped area that contributes to rainfall runoff harvesting should be increased to 3,548ha to achieve a total area of 5,934ha.	y	N*	y	?

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
M029		Claims modelled overbank flow diversions are grossly underestimated due to not frequent enough access to overbank flow.	Update the threshold for overbank flow access.	Review of satellite imagery, hydraulic modelling and discussions with WaterNSW.	y	N*	y	y
M030		Claims modelling underestimates overbank flow harvesting due to the absence of some large pipes in the hydraulic modelling.	Change in flow threshold for overbank flow access from 52,000 to 34,000ML/day	Review of the hydraulic modelling and the available pipe data.	y	N*	y	?
M031		Claims modelled overbank flow diversions are grossly underestimated due to less frequent access to overbank flow. It is also claimed that the developed and undeveloped area is incorrect.	Update the threshold for overbank flow access.	Review of satellite imagery, hydraulic modelling and discussions with WaterNSW. Photos and lists of events when overbank flow commenced	y	N*	y	y
			Update developed and undeveloped areas.	Reviewed against satellite imagery.	y	y	y	y
M040		Claims modelling grossly underestimates floodplain harvesting take due to not frequent enough access to overland flow.	Changed flood runner where overbank flow is accessed.	Review of satellite imagery and hydraulic modelling indicate property was located on the wrong flood runner and getting	y	N*	y	y

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
				less overbank flow access than can be observed. Discussion with Water NSW highlighted the property would move to the Bulgeraga Creek flood runner. This is consistent with the other reviews.				
			Decreased overbank flow threshold for flood runner to 3,500ML/d.	Review of satellite imagery and hydraulic modelling indicate property was located on the wrong flood runner and getting less overbank flow access than can be observed. Discussion with Water NSW highlighted the property would move to the Bulgeraga Creek flood runner. This is consistent with the other reviews.	y	N*	y	y

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
M049		Claims nearby undeveloped area has not been considered.	No change	Review of satellite imagery and model parameters has indicated that the nominated additional areas are already included in modelling.	y	y	y	y
M052		Claims modelling grossly underestimates overbank flow harvesting and overestimates rainfall runoff harvesting.	Moving the overbank flow access to the Bulgeraga Creek flood runner.	Review of satellite imagery and hydraulic modelling indicate property was located on the wrong flood runner.	y	N*	y	y
		A request to change the rainfall station was also made.	No change	Original climate station is much closer to this property, per previous advice to the Review Committee and in line with all modelling.	y	y	y	y
M053		Claims overbank flow access occurs for extended periods up to 6 months.	No changes to the modelling are recommended	Review of satellite imagery and hydraulic modelling has indicated there is insufficient evidence to make changes to modelling. Claims that access extends for up to 6 months were not	y	y	y	y

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
				substantiated by satellite imagery or other evidence.				
M056		Claims overbank flow take is underestimated due to a lack of access.	No change	Review of satellite imagery and hydraulic modelling has indicated that modelling already aligns closely with landholder claims. modelled and observed flow duration curves for this river reach match reasonably well, so expected the frequency of modelled and observed overbank flow events will be consistent.	y	y	y	y

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
M057		Claims overbank flow take is underestimated due to a lack of access.	Move property to a different flood runner.	Imagery/modelling indicated that floodplain harvesting access for this property occurs from an adjacent flood runner. Making this change to the model configuration resulted in more frequent access that is closer to the access claimed in the submission.	Y	N*	?	?
M060		Claims modelled floodplain harvesting diversions are underestimated.	Add inflow upstream of the property (Note – changed from ‘no change’ and re-sent to committee for endorsement following the meeting. Endorsements updated to reflect this)	After reviewing LiDAR data it was found that there is considerable local catchment area that drains directly onto this property. This area was represented by including simulation of rainfall runoff as an inflow to the flood runner upstream of this property that has an area of approximately 74km ² .	y	N*	y	?

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
		For the climate station used to be altered to either 51025 or 51049.	The nominated rainfall station change cannot be made due to the short period of data coverage compared to nearby stations.	Period of available data for climate station	y	y	y	y
M070		Modelling submission claims both developed and undeveloped areas have been underestimated, and that rainfall runoff and floodplain harvesting take have been underestimated.	Updating developed and undeveloped areas	After reviewing satellite imagery the nominated developed area is plausible and should be accepted. The total property area appears to drain to the farm storages, and this area was used to estimate an updated undeveloped area in excess of 20,000ha.	y	N*	y	?
M076		Submission claims underestimated rainfall runoff harvesting due to additional undeveloped areas.	No change	A review of satellite imagery has shown that the nominated additional area is within the property boundary of other floodplain harvesting eligible properties and as a result it is not eligible for inclusion in the area of this	y	y	y	y

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
				property, and no change to the modelling is recommended on the basis of this submission				
M077		Submission provides additional details about developed area and rainfall runoff characteristics.	Update to the developed area	A review of satellite imagery has shown that the nominated developed area of 860ha is reasonable and should be incorporated into modelling.	y	N*	y	y
M082		Submission claims modelled floodplain harvesting diversions are underestimated due to insufficient floodplain harvesting access.	Move the property to another flood runner	After reviewing satellite imagery it was found that the level of access in the model is comparable to that of the observed access for several observed events. Since the property has access to two flood runners, the property has been	y	N*	y	y

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
				moved in the model to the flood runner with slightly more frequent access.				
M085		Submission claims modelled floodplain harvesting diversions are underestimated due to not including 74km2 of catchment area to the South.	Add inflow upstream of the property	After reviewing satellite imagery it was found that there is considerable local catchment area that drains directly onto this property. This area was represented by including simulation of rainfall runoff as an inflow to the flood runner upstream of this property with an area of approximately 74km2, consistent with the approach taken for M060.	y	N*	y	n

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
M088		Submission claims modelling grossly underestimates floodplain harvesting take due to the absence in the model of a considerable local catchment area that generates rainfall runoff and not frequent enough access to overland flow	Update to undeveloped area	A review of the hydraulic modelling, LiDAR and satellite imagery has indicated that most of the floodplain harvesting access to the property comes from rainfall runoff a from a neighbouring 3,386ha catchment. This area was previously underestimated in the model and has been updated.	y	y	y	y
M094		Submission requests updating the climate station from Warren to Trangie.	No change	A review of the available climate stations for modelling has indicated that the requested station is not represented in the model due to other nearby stations having higher quality records.	y	y	y	y

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
M095		Submission claims modelling underestimates overbank flow harvesting due to the absence of some large pipes in the hydraulic modelling.	Change in flow threshold for overbank flow access	A review of the hydraulic modelling and the available pipe data found that the described pipes were not being adequately represented in the modelling. Hence the flow threshold in the model should be updated from 52,000ML/d to 34,000ML/d, based on updated hydraulic modelling results, consistent with M030.	y	n	y	n
M096		Claims modelled floodplain harvesting usage is grossly underestimated due to a lack of overbank flow access.	Moved to a different point on the flood runner	After reviewing satellite imagery and hydraulic modelling it was found that modelling was adequately representing overbank flow access. Modelling of the property should, however, be reconfigured to a point on the flood runner that better	y	y	y	y

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
				represents the level of observed overbank flow access. It was found that in many events where there is overbank flow access the modelled storage has already been filled by rainfall runoff harvesting.				
M097		Submission claims modelled floodplain harvesting usage is grossly underestimated due to a lack of overbank flow access.	Moved to a different point on the flood runner	After reviewing satellite imagery and hydraulic modelling it was found that modelling was adequately representing overbank flow access. The property should however be moved to a point on the flood runner that better represents the level of observed overbank flow access.	y	y	y	y

					Committee endorsement of changes			
ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis				
M098		Submission requests developed area be updated.	Update to developed area from 197 to 330ha	A review of satellite imagery has indicated the nominated developed area is reasonable and should be accepted.	y	N*	y	?
M101		Submission requests updating the climate station from Narromine to Trangie.	No change	A review of the available climate stations to modelling has indicated that the requested station is not used in the modelling due to other nearby stations having higher quality records.	y	y	y	y
M113		Submission claims modelling underestimates rainfall runoff plus overbank flow harvesting due to an underestimated developed and undeveloped area.	Update developed area and undeveloped area for harvesting rainfall runoff	After reviewing LiDAR data and satellite imagery the nominated developed areas and additional undeveloped area are accepted. The additional undeveloped area assigned to the property from Red Hill is 578ha.	y	N*	y	y

ROI	Property	Landholder request/s	DPE recommended change/s	Evidence source/DPE analysis	Committee endorsement of changes			
M121		Submission claims the developed area in the model is underestimated leading to an underestimation in rainfall runoff harvesting.	Updates to developed and undeveloped area	A review of satellite imagery has indicated that the nominated developed area cannot be reconciled with the observed satellite data, which suggests a maximum developed area of 653ha is reasonable and should not be changed. However, the property boundaries indicate that the nominated area includes undeveloped area that would contribute to rainfall runoff harvesting, and the undeveloped area should be increased to 1,181ha to achieve a total area equal to the nominated 1,834ha.	y	y	y	y

* non-consensus report received.